

The Classical Review

FEBRUARY 1889.

THE *Classical Review* enters on its third year of existence under new and improved conditions. The cooperation of American scholars, which has long been desired by the Editors, has at length been happily accomplished by the accession of Prof. THOMAS D. SEYMOUR of Yale University, Prof. JOHN H. WRIGHT of Harvard University, and Prof. W. G. HALE of Cornell University, to the editorial staff; while Messrs. GINN and Co. of Boston will in future be associated with Mr. NUTT in the publication of the *Review*. In order to make room for the American contributions, of which the present number gives a preliminary instalment, the size of the *Review* has been materially increased at a very slight additional cost to the subscribers,—a change which it is hoped may also enable us to make various other improvements in the management of the *Review*.

We have great hopes that this new development will not only afford to Englishmen an opportunity of becoming better acquainted with the excellent work which is being done in America; but that the closer intercourse thus established between the scholars of England and America may contribute to raise the level of classical learning wherever the English language is spoken. We regard this as a matter of universal interest, because we believe that for a fruitful study of Greek and Roman antiquity the practical judgment of the English is no less needful than the unwearied research and the daring speculation of the Germans, or the lucidity and mental vivacity of the French.

PHILOLOGICAL NOTES.

VI.

THE intrusive *a* of the Greek perfect and aorist has its proper place after consonants before the endings of the second person of all numbers. In the earliest form of the language it did not yet exist in the first person plural of the perfect. But phonetic necessity had led to its appearance in the aorist. Such forms as ἐρύπατε, ἐρύσαν could

not be combined in one paradigm with ἐρύμμεν (ἐρύψμεν), and ἐρύσαμεν was the result. Into the 3rd. plur. of the perfect the *a* had found its way betimes, but it was excluded from the aorist, apparently again for phonetic reasons. The form ἐρύσαν was sufficiently plain, and the longer form ἐρύσαντων would have had, I think, no parallel in the language. That the Latin should have inserted *e* in the same place

(*scripserant*) is natural both because of the generalising character of the language and because of the difference of the syllables *se* and *sa* or *ra* in Latin, which obviated the difficulty of the two successive sibilants.

If we pursue the assumption that the terminations of the Latin perfect and aorist were originally identical with those of the Greek, and that the only differences were those arising from the differences of the phonetic laws of the two languages, and are such as I have described, we get for the primary forms of the aorist and perfect:—

1. *scripse*, *scripseste*, *scripset*, *scripsemus*, *scripsestes*, *scripsezant*.

2. *fecē*, *fecēste*, *fecēt*, *fecimus*, *fecestes*, *fecēze*.

Let us neglect for a while the aorist, and ask what is the relation between the hypothetical *fecēt* and the historical *fecit*, *fecit* *fecit*; Obviously *fecēt* stands to *fecit* as *λέγε(τ)* to *λέγει(τ)*. In other words, as in the Greek present as compared with the imperfect, an *iota* is inserted after the first vowel following the root, so in the historical Latin perfect an *i* is similarly inserted in the same place. The only difference is that the Latin does not confine the insertion to the singular, but agreeably to the generalising tendency of the language extends the operation throughout the tense. Inserting then this characteristic *i*, as I have ventured to call it, we get

fecēi, *fecēisti*, *fecēit*, *fecimus*, *fecēistes*, *fecēize*.

It is probable that the actual form of the 2nd. singular, which it is generally admitted borrowed its final *i* from the two adjacent forms, had in historical Latin shortened the vowel of the penultimate. This would follow from the law that a long vowel is shortened sooner or later before *s* followed by a consonant. Cf. *vester* = *vōster* = *vōster*, where the shortening has ultimately ensued, in spite of the retarding influence of *vōs*. So *vēnum* = *vēsnum* = *vōsnum* = *vōsnum* = *ῥωνος*, the Greek *ῥωνος*.

The classical forms *iūsti*, *iūt* stand apart, but admit of an easy explanation. They were originally *iūisti*, *iūt*, where the first *i* is the reduplication, the second the root and the third the personal termination. Philological processes require time, and while *fecēisti* and *fecēit* were shortening into *fecēsti* and *fecēt*, *iūisti*, *iūt* were contracting into *iūsti* and *iūt*.

The characteristic *i* was not inserted in *feceront*, which it is obvious lies outside the general scheme of formation.

There is only one weak point that I can see

in the theory, and that lies in the transition of *fecēize* into *fecere*. It is known that *i* becomes *e* before *r* substituted for *s*. But what becomes of the diphthong under the same circumstances? It seems natural to say that *ei* would become *ee* or *ē*. But no parallel instance has been found, and I am forced to content myself with an appeal to analogy and the more obvious mode of formation in the other persons.

That the characteristic *i* was inserted not only after consonants but after *i* and *u* is clear (*audii*, *statui*). On the other hand it is never found after *ā*, *ē*, *ō*. The strong bent towards uniformity which marks the Latin language warrants us, I believe, in assuming that *i* was originally inserted after *ā*, *ē*, *ō* as everywhere else in the perfect, but afterwards disappeared according to the law by which *āi*, *ēi*, *ōi* (at least in syllables not final) passed into *ā*, *ē*, *ō*. Thus, as Thurneysen has shown, *ovum* = *ōvum* = *ōvium* = *ὄφιον* = *φόν*. So *lēvis* = *lēvis* = *ληγος* = *ληγος* = *λεῖος*. So *prāvus* = *prāvius* = *πρᾶφος* = *πρᾶος*, the original meaning being 'bent,' 'pliant.'

To confirm the morphological identity of the Greek presential *i* and the characteristic *i* of the Latin perfect it remains to point out their similarity of meaning. The special relation to the present which marks the meaning of the perfect universally in Greek, and partially in Latin, rests first on the influence of the inherited *praeteritopraesentia*; and secondly on the contrast between the perfect and the aorist, especially that in *-sa* which is itself peculiar to Greek and Latin. This distinction was emphasised by a more general use of the reduplication than is known in other languages, and the creation of a new type in *-ka*, as I hope to establish in my next article. Latin lost by degrees the sign of reduplication, but heightened at once the contrast of the perfect with the aorist, and its relation to the present by inserting in the perfect and not in the aorist the characteristic *i* which, in the consciousness of both languages, I assume to have borne a presential character. But phonetic reasons forbade the distinction to last. By the confusion of unaccented vowels and the shortening of others, little or no distinction could be made between *fecēiste*, *fecimus* and *fecēistes* on the one hand, and *scripseste*, *scripsemus* and *scripsestes* on the other. And even in the first and third persons of the singular as soon as the law that shortened the finals of iambic words came into play, such common words as *dedei*, *dedit* and *stetei*, *stetit* must have been identified in inflection with *scripse*, *scripset*. *Scripserant*

alone survived, which was however identified in meaning with its morphological equivalent *fecerant*.

So little of early Latin survives that it is not easy to establish the existence of these separate forms of the perfect and aorist. But the contracted forms such as *duxi*, which occurs frequently in early Latin, imply that the elided vowel of *duxi* was short, while the absence of any instance like *perculsti*, *compulsti* is an argument in favour of the view that the corresponding vowel in the perfect was long. *Occisti* is not a proof to the contrary. *Caedo* in this

case has followed the instinct of the language in forming an aorist in *-si* instead of *cecidi*, which is the only reduplicated perfect with an originally long vowel in the penultimate.

In some such way as I have described the two tenses were fused, and the Latin perfect acquired a twofold character which makes it one of the difficulties of the language. I have spoken of the characteristic *i*, as peculiar to Latin, but the early and frequent form *ἀνώγει* suggests that the tendency to the insertion once existed in Greek in such forms as were destitute of reduplication.

FRED. W. WALKER.

ΕΡΣΑΙ, ΗΠΟΓΟΝΟΙ, ΜΕΤΑΣΣΑΙ.

στέλνοντο δὲ σηκοί
ἀρνῶν ἢ δ' ἐρίφων διακεκριμένας δὲ ἕκασται
ἔρχατο· χωρὶς μὲν πρόγονοι, χωρὶς δὲ μέτασσαι,
χωρὶς δ' αὖθ' ἔρσαι.—*Od.* ix. 219—222.

Editors of the *Odyssey*, so far as I can discover, universally explain πρόγονοι, μέτασσαι and ἔρσαι as three different kinds of lambs or kids, πρόγονοι being early lambs (firstlings) and ἔρσαι late or very young lambs, while μέτασσαι form an intermediate class. One or two of the editors express a little surprise at finding πρόγονοι used in this way: Koch indeed remarks that we should rather expect πρωτόγονοι. μέτασσαι is generally connected with μετά, though some give μέσος or μετά and μέσος both, as if consonants were things with which philology had nothing to do. ἔρσαι all are agreed means 'dew,' and thence 'young ones'; and Aeschylus (*Agam.* 141 δρόσοισι μαλερῶν λεόντων), and Sophocles (*Fr.* 962 ψακαλοῦχοι and ψάκαλον) are quoted for the same meaning.

Let us take the last of these three words first. Though whether we should write ἔρσαι or ἔρσαι is not certain, yet there can be no doubt that the word here is connected with the same root as the Homeric ἐρση (always, with one doubtful exception, trisyllabic). But the word has cognates much nearer in meaning in other languages. As examples of this relationship may be cited Latin *verres* (= *versēs, Brugmann, *Grundriss*, § 571), and Lithuanian *vešzias*¹ (*op. cit.* § 587).

¹ The very ingenious explanation of these forms given by my friend Dr. W. Streitberg in his Inaugural Dissertation (Halle 1888, see *Paul and Braune's Beitr.* xiv. 2), and accepted by Brugmann, *Grundriss* ii. p. 116, seems to me not absolutely conclusive. The constant assertion that *Cornelis* is older than *Cornelius* has certainly no strong support in the existing evidence. But in Lithuanian the form *vešzias* apparently does not occur.

Both of these words, like ἔρσαι here, betoken young animals. For *verres* being a young pig we have the authority of Varro (*R. R.* 2, 4. f.: *verres anniculi* and *semestres*: cf. also *Hor. Od.* iii. 22. 7). The Lithuanian *vešzias* means 'a calf': cf. *Skt. vṛshas*, 'bull.' The Latin and the Lithuanian words are very closely related. In Varro the form *verris* for the nominative also occurs, and Valerius Probus (see Forcellini, *sub voc. verrēs*) informs us that Cicero used *Verri* as the genitive (see also Bücheler-Windekilde, *Lateinische Declination*, § 50). The fuller form *Verris* is preserved in the name of the grammarian Verris Flaccus; and *Verris* is a form like *Cornelis*, *Caecilis*, *alis*, in early Latin. Thus *Lat. verrius*: *Lith. vešzias* = *Lat. verris*: *Lith. vešzias*. Whether *verrēs* is a corruption of the form *verris* I shall leave undecided; it is at any rate strange that this is the only Roman gentile name which does not end in *-ius*. If *verrēs* could be proved to be an original form the oblique cases of which have passed over to the *i*-stems, one might be led to conjecture a singular *Ἐρίρης* to this Greek form. That however is extremely unlikely, but there can, I think, be no doubt that the Greek, Latin and Lithuanian words are closely connected, even if the first is not absolutely identical with the other two. The original meaning would simply be 'young animal,' and then the different languages specialised the word in different senses, as has happened in so many other cases. Aeschylus' δρόσοι and Sophocles' ψακαλοῦχοι μητέρες, with Eustathius' ψάκαλα· τὰ ἔμβρνα

καὶ τὰ ἄρτι δὴ γεγονότα, are imitations of the Homeric passage when the original meaning of ἔρσαι was no longer clearly understood.

Let us now return to the first of our three words, πρόγονοι. The use of the word for 'oldest lambs' (or kids) might perhaps be defended by πρόγονος, a 'stepson,' and L. and S. should therefore have put this meaning under that heading rather than along with πρόγονος, 'ancestor.' πρωτόγονος is confined to the *Iliad*, though occurring there several times in the required sense (as IV. 102, XXIII. 864); but προγενέστερος is common to both *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. πρόγονος, however, is ἀπαξ εἰρημένον in Homer. Before deciding what meaning we should attach to it we must see how Polyphemus tends his flocks. When Odysseus arrives he finds the σκηαὶ packed full of lambs and kids. These σκηαὶ were pens specially constructed for the young ones—Eustathius on *Il.* xviii. 589: σκηαὶ δὲ μάλιστα οἱ τῶν νεογνῶν λέγονται (see A. Thaer, *Philologus*, xxix. p. 604). When Polyphemus comes home later he drives into the cave πάντα μάλ' ὅσ' ἤμελεγε (238), but leaves the males outside (τὰ δ' ἄρσενά λείπε θύρῳ). Whether we should read βαθείης ἔντοθεν αὐλῆς with Rumpf in 239, or let ἔκτοθεν stand is not material to the argument. In either case the males and females are separated. In 244 the ewes are milked, and her suckling (ἐμβρυνον) is put under each of them after Polyphemus has got as much milk as he wants. Now these ἐμβρυνα (ἐμβρυνον and βρέφος, *Il.*, Ψ 266, seem to have exchanged meanings before the Attic period) must be the young ones which Odysseus found in the σκηαὶ on his arrival, else Polyphemus doubtless would have had very little return for his trouble in milking. From 308-9 we may gather that the lambs were again separated from their dams and confined by themselves during the night, for in the morning the milking is performed as before and the suckling placed under each. Next night, luckily for Odysseus, Polyphemus for some reason takes into the cave the rams as well (338-9); but still the ewes are kept separate from the sucklings, for next morning they bleat unmilked round the pens, and their udders are like to burst (439-440). The words μέμκον ἀνήμελκτοι περὶ σκηαῖς must mean that the ewes are trying to reach their young ones in the pens and the reason is given—οὐθάρτα γὰρ σφαραγεῖντο; surely this gives a better and more natural sense than Ameis-Hentze's inter-

pretation (ed. 7) 'in den Hürden (Pferchen) umher.' Apparently only the rams and wethers go out of the cave with Odysseus and his men (425).

Thus it will be seen there is a well-marked tripartite division of the Cyclops' flocks all through. Is not this the division which is meant by πρόγονοι, μέτασσαι, ἔρσαι? The πρόγονοι are the ἄρσενες δῖες of 425, the word thus retaining its natural sense; the μέτασσαι are the θήλειαι of 439; and the ἔρσαι are those with which the σκηαὶ are crammed in 219, and which are thus equivalent to ἐμβρυνα ('Sammelbegriff für Säuglinge,' Thaer, *loc. cit.*).

There is absolutely nothing anywhere in the book to make against this interpretation. Even though ἔρχατο 221 be pressed, Rumpf's reading ἔντοθεν makes the new explanation as feasible as the old.

It remains to explain the form μέτασσαι. The ordinary explanation given by those who go beyond the mere guess μετά, μέσος is *μετακ-ιαι (Osthoff, *Morphologische Untersuchungen* ii. 27), the stem being μετακ-, as in μεταξὺ. This is phonetically perfect. My own idea—and I am well aware how very doubtful it will seem—is that μέτασσαι is the feminine of the present participle of μέτεμι (= μετά εἰμί, 'I am along with'), 'ewes with lambs at foot,' as our shepherds say. The feminine of the participle, as the weakest form of the root *sṃtīa, becomes *satīa, *sassa, *άσσα: cf. Doric ἄσσα and Cretan ἰάττα (Gortyn Insc. 8. 47). In these forms philologists consider that ε- and ι- have been borrowed from the strong forms of the verb (Gustav Meyer, *Griech. Gram.* § 20). We should certainly expect μέθασσαι as the phonetically correct form, but it may have followed the fashion of the greater number of the forms of the verb and thus have taken τ for θ. Moreover, if this part of the poem was originally in Aeolic, which is certainly not yet proved, there would have been no rough breathing.

Long after arriving at the above conclusions I found from Ebeling's *Lexicon* that my interpretation of μέτασσαι had been anticipated many centuries ago by Suidas, who explains the word as τὰ ὑπαρῶν πρόβατα. Thus, be the derivation of this word what it may, I hope I may claim to have established the correct meaning of μέτασσαι and its fellows.

P. GILES.

NIESE ON THE LICINIAN-SEXTIAN AGRARIAN LAW.

THE last number of *Hermes* (Band xxiii. Heft 3) contains an article by Prof. Niese of Marburg, entitled *das so-genannte licinisch-sextische Ackergesetz*, in which the author undertakes to prove that the alleged agrarian provisions of the Licinian laws do not rest upon genuine and trustworthy tradition, and that this legislation—if there was any such, which he is inclined to doubt—had only the effect of admitting plebeians to the consulship. His reasons are as follows: 1. That the accounts of the early agrarian legislation given by Appian (B. C. i. 7–8), and Plutarch (*T. Gracchus*, 8) appear to place it only a short time before the time of the Gracchi. 2. That this legislation was not consistent with the political and economical condition of Italy at the beginning of the fourth century before Christ, but that on the other hand it was naturally called out by the condition of things after the second Punic war. To this he adds that Livy, in his account of the contest upon the laws, makes very little of their agrarian provisions (*in den Verhandlungen über die Gesetzesvorschläge . . . ist von diesem Gesetz keine Rede*), so that they may be regarded almost as an afterthought and a late interpolation. This last assertion is at least exaggerated. In the first promulgation of the laws (vi. 35) the three provisions stand on an equal footing, that in regard to the consulship being mentioned last: during the ten years of the agitation they were constantly spoken of as *leges*; and in the argument of Licinius and Sextius (ch. 36, 11) the agrarian provision is made the most prominent. Niese's remark rests no doubt upon the absence of mention of anything but the consulship in the speech of Appius Claudius (chaps. 40, 41): but this is easily explained by the fact that the other two provisions had been already accepted by the senate (39, 2), so that this was the only thing that remained to discuss.

In regard to the first point he is certainly correct, that Appian and perhaps Plutarch appear to place the legislation not long before the Gracchi: and no doubt Appian's account rests upon an early and authentic tradition. But this view can hardly be considered explicit enough to balance positive evidence on the other side, especially as Appian does not attribute it to any definite person or assign it to any definite time. Plutarch, on the other hand, in another

passage (*Cam.* 39) expressly attributes it to Licinius Stolo, the contemporary of Camillus. Niese says that, with the exception of Varro (*R. R.*, i., 2, 9) no writer before Livy ascribes this law to Licinius Stolo. He overlooks Tullius Tiro, a freedman of Cicero, who speaks of it as *plebiscitum Stolonis* (Gell. vi., 3, 40); and the unanimity with which it is called *law of Stolo* or *Licinian law* (cf. the jurist Sextus Caecilius, in Gell. xx., 1, 23) warrants us in connecting it with some person named Licinius Stolo. Niese admits that the law must have been passed before b.c. 167, and makes light of the failure of Livy to mention it in his very full narration of that period. That we have no information of any person then living of this name is perhaps of little weight as an argument; and yet it is hard to believe that Livy would have said nothing of so important a law and its author. If anything is certain in the early history of the Roman legislation it is that this law—whenever passed—was the work of a Licinius Stolo: and to what other Licinius Stolo than the consul of 364 can we ascribe it?

The other argument, that the circumstances of the republic at this period did not call for or indeed admit such legislation, rests upon the calculation that the territory of the Roman people was not yet extensive enough to allow large estates to be occupied, such as this law assumes. But it appears to us that there was no point of time in Roman history in which these restrictions would be more timely. After a period of depression and defensive wars, Rome had suddenly started forward on her career of conquest, and had already taken long strides towards the annexation of all the lands about her. And, what is very significant, the agrarian agitation, which had slumbered for nearly two generations, was—according to Livy's account—revived at just the time of the first conquests. Fidenae was conquered b.c. 426, and the very next year began the agitation for the agrarian law: in 418 Labicum was conquered, in 415 Bole, in 406 Auxur, in 396 Veii, in 395 Capena, in 386 the Ager Pomptinus. By these acquisitions the *ager Romanus* was at least doubled in extent; and, admitting that a large part of the newly acquired territory was distributed *viritim*, there still remained enough public land open to occupation to give cause for anxiety to the reforming

party. It is evident that, while the power of Rome was not impaired by the Gallic invasion, the social and economical condition of the people was seriously affected, as is shown by the affair of Marcus Manlius: nothing is more natural than that the land question and the question of indebtedness, the burning questions of the hour, should enter into the great settlement of 367 along with the purely political question of the plebeian consulship.

The paper which we have been criticizing is professedly in the line of Mommsen's paper upon 'the three demagogues' (Spurius Cassius, Spurius Maelius, and Marcus Manlius) in the second volume of his *Römische Forschungen*. The controlling idea of these papers is that the economical controversies of the early republic are only the reflection of those of the later republic—not resting upon genuine tradition, but interpolated in the annals by the democratic writers of the last century of the republic

in order to bolster up the cause of their own party. It is hard to reconcile this interpretation with the general tone of Mommsen's history: for he was the first who gave due weight to economical forces in his treatment of early Roman history, and by this he placed in our hands the key to unlock its most difficult problems. Possibly the agrarian laws, the distribution of corn, and the abolition of debts—the issues of the day—coloured unduly the delineation of early events in the writings of the last century of the republic: but that these questions were present in the first century and formed a constant subject of controversy is not only possible in itself, but is what Mommsen more than any other writer has taught us to believe. If we cannot accept this part of Livy's account—that is, in its main features—we might as well give up the attempt to understand these times at all.

W. F. ALLEN,
University of Wisconsin, Madison.

ON THE CONSECUTION OF TENSES IN LATIN AFTER A PRINCIPAL VERB IN THE PERFECT-ABSOLUTE.

It seems to be a common if not universal belief among English scholars that the past tense in Latin has two distinct consecutions; one, when it is used as an aorist, in which case it is to be treated as an historical tense and ought to have the subjoined verb in the imperfect; the other, when it is used as a perfect-absolute, in which case we are told that it is to be treated as a primary tense and ought regularly to have the subjoined verb in the present or perfect.

I have long believed that there is no ground for this distinction. While Professor Kennedy (*P.S.G.* § 229) makes an especial exception of Cicero in the words, 'It is however the prevailing idiom of Cicero to construct the present-past with historic consecution,' I should extend this to Caesar, Sallust, Livy, Tacitus, the younger Pliny and Terence; and I have no doubt the same is true of all other prose and dramatic writers. In the writers I have mentioned the perfect-absolute takes historic consecution in nearly seventy-five per cent. of the cases in which it occurs; and of the remaining twenty-five per cent. a large number are only apparent and not real exceptions.

It is obvious that the perfect-absolute is not likely to occur frequently except in the

works of an author who writes habitually in the first person. It is therefore natural to expect that it will be of rare occurrence in historical writings.

In Caesar, so far as I have noticed, it only occurs four times. In three of these instances the subjoined verb is in the imperfect; in the fourth, for a special reason, it is in the present.

In Sallust I have noticed five instances. In four of these the subjoined verb is in the imperfect; one is, perhaps, a real exception.

In Tacitus I have noticed seventeen instances. In eleven of these the subjoined verb is in the imperfect; in five the subjoined verb is, for special reasons, in the present; one is a real exception.

In Livy, owing to the greater frequency of speeches in the first person, instances are more numerous. In his first decade I have noticed twenty-seven instances. In twenty-two of these the subjoined verb is in the imperfect; in four, for special reasons, it is in the present; one is a real exception.

In Pliny the question is complicated (though not so much as in Cicero's letters) by the difficulty of deciding how far he has adopted the epistolary use of the aorist and imperfect. This is especially the case in his

correspondence with Trajan. But taking the first nine books of his letters and the Panegyric, there will, I believe, be found to be forty-six clear instances of the perfect-absolute. In thirty-three of these the subjoined verb is in the imperfect; in thirteen, for special reasons, the subjoined verb is in the present.

Terence is more variable than the other writers I have mentioned; but he also in a considerable majority of instances follows the 'prevailing idiom.'

It is, of course, highly probable that I may have passed over some instances of the occurrence of the perfect-absolute in these writers. It is also certain that some scholars would prefer to class as aorists some of the instances which I have classed as perfects-absolute. But after making every allowance there will still remain a very large preponderance of instances in which the perfect-absolute takes historic consecution.

Although it was from noticing the constant recurrence of this idiom in Cicero (before I was aware that Professor Kennedy had especially excepted that author) that I was led to examine the question, it is not necessary for me to enumerate instances from Cicero; first because Professor Kennedy's dictum will probably be sufficient for most scholars, and secondly because, from a note by Mr. J. S. Reid, appended to Professor Mayor's note on Cic. *Nat. D.* 1, 2, 3, I learn that Cicero's usage has been made the subject of a treatise by Hugo Lieven:—*Die Consecutio Temporum des Cicero*. Riga, 1872. I will therefore state my own conclusions on the matter, hoping that they will be found to agree in the main with what Lieven says with regard to Cicero's usage.

1. The past tense in Latin, when used as a perfect-absolute, takes precisely the same consecution as the same tense when used as an aorist; that is, the subjoined verb is regularly in the imperfect. The following are typical instances (I confine myself to the subjunctives of result and purpose):—

(a) Where the subjoined imperfect expresses a state now existing, and where therefore it is represented in English by the present.

Mihi ut urbi sine vestro motu ac sine ullo tumultu satis esset praesidii consultum ac provisum est. (esset, 'there is'.)—Cic. *Cat.* 2, 12, 26.

C. Sempronium nihil moror, quando hoc est in imperio consecutus ut tam carus esset militibus. (esset, 'he is'.)—Liv. 4, 42, 8.

Me meae tamen (fortunae) ne nimis poeniteret tua virtute perfectum est. (me poeniteret, 'I am dissatisfied'.)—Cic. *Ep. F.* 1, 7, 8.

(b) Where the subjoined imperfect expresses an action or process already completed, and where therefore it is represented in English by the perfect-absolute.

More hominum evenit ut quod sum nactus mali prius rescisceres tu quam ego illud quod tibi evenit boni. (rescisceres, 'you have heard of'.)—Ter. *And.* 967.

Postremo adhuc nemo exstitit cujus virtutes nullo vitiorum confinio laederentur. (laederentur, 'have been marred'.)—Plin. *Pan.* 4, 5.

(c) Where the subjoined imperfect expresses an action or process either general or now going on or about to go on, and where therefore it is represented in English by the present or future.

At in his (numeris ac modis) si paullum modo offensum est ut aut contractione brevius fieret aut productione longius, theatra tota reclamant. (fieret, 'becomes'.)—Cic. *De Orat.* 3, 50, 195.

(I consider the above instance to be especially noteworthy, because offensum est is used frequently, and would be represented in English by the present; and yet owing to its form it is followed by the imperfect subjunctive.)

Quod fortasse aliquando universae republicae, nunc quidem profecto isti provinciae contigit, ut is in ea summam potestatem haberet cui in doctrina, cui in virtute atque in humanitate percipienda plurimum a pueritia studii fuisset et temporis. (haberet, 'possesses' 'exercises'.)—Cic. *Ep. Q. F.* 1, 10, 29.

Nil est precii loci relictum; jam perturbavi omnia; erum fefelli; in nuptias conieci erilem filium; feci hodie ut fierent insperante hoc atque invito Pamphilo. (fierent, 'are taking place,' or 'are about to take place'.)—Ter. *And.* 601.

(d) Where the subjoined imperfect expresses a purpose which is either now taking effect or is to take effect hereafter, and where therefore it is represented in the English by the auxiliary 'may.'

Miseret me: itaque ut ne viderem misera huc ecfugi foras quae futura exempla dicunt in eum indigna. (ut ne viderem, 'that I may avoid seeing'.)—Ter. *Eun.* 945.

Nec ideo Rhenum insedimus ut Italian tueremur; sed ne quis alius Ariovistus Galliarum poteretur. (tueremur, 'may defend,' poteretur, 'may become master'.)—Tac. *Hist.* 4, 73, 4.

2. *Apparent Exceptions.*

There are, as I have said, on the whole, about twenty-five per cent. of exceptions to the use of the imperfect in the subjunctive clause. A considerable number of these will be found to be only apparent exceptions; namely, where the principal verb, although in the past tense, is in reality a phrase equivalent to a present. Such phrases are *adeon rem rediisse—eo (necessitatis) ventum est—nati sumus—(natura) comparatum est—datum est nobis—(lege) cautum est, &c.*

3. *Real Exceptions.*

(a) Where subjunctive expresses existing state. Real exceptions under this head are rare. There is one in *Tac. Ann.* 14, 53, 2, *tantum honorum in me cumulasti ut nihil felicitati desit*, and perhaps another in *Sall. Jug.* 14, 9, *hucine beneficia evasere ut... extinctor sit*, though I should class the latter among the apparent exceptions. In *Ter. Eun.* 240 the best reading is undoubtedly *esset*, and in *Heaut.* 596 Bentley's correction *aut est* is generally adopted.

(b) Where subjunctive expresses completed action. The exceptions under this head are also rare. In the authors I have mentioned I have noticed one instance, *Liv.* 8, 13, 4. They are, I believe, proportionately more frequent in Cicero than in any other author. But there is often a special reason for the use of the perfect in the subjoined clause. For instance, in the sentence, *Cic. Tusc. D.* 5, 39, 114, *Qui motus hominum * * * non ita expictus est ut quae ipse non viderit nos ut videremus effecerit?*—I regard *ita expictus est* as a virtual present, corresponding with *videmus* in the previous sentence. I should also prefer to treat as aorists most of the instances where the subjunctive clause is negative, e.g. *Cic. Ep. Q. F.* 1, 2, 8.

(c and d) The exceptions under these heads are more frequent, especially (1) where the result or purpose is still future, (2) where the subjoined verb expresses a mental process or a contingency. There is one class of exceptions under this head which is especially frequent; namely, where the expression in the subjunctive clause is a periphrasis consisting of an infinitive with *videatur*, *possit*, *sperem*, *putem*, &c. It will, I believe, be found that a large proportion of the exceptions which occur in Cicero are of this kind.

(I have not spoken of those instances where the principal verb is combined with an infinitive. When this is the case the consecution will depend upon the effect of the phrase as a whole. For instance, in

Plin. 6, 29, 4, *video multos consecutos* is equivalent to *multi ut video consecuti sunt*, and takes the usual consecution of the perfect. In *Liv.* 8, 33, 10, *nos deduci jussisti* is equivalent to *jussu tuo deducti sumus*, and also takes the usual consecution of the perfect. But in *Tacitus, Hist.* 4, 73, 2, *statui pauca disserere* is equivalent to a future, and therefore takes the subjoined verb in the present.)

In the foregoing remarks I have used the terms aorist and perfect-absolute out of deference to the ordinary fashion. But I hold that the Latin writers themselves looked upon the tense simply as a past tense, and were no more conscious of two meanings attaching to the tense than of two constructions to be observed in the clauses subjoined to it.

TABLE OF INSTANCES.

1. *Normal.*—Where the perfect-absolute is followed by the imperfect in the subjunctive clause. (A very few instances of indirect questions are included.)

Caesar, B.G. 4, 1, 10; *B.C.* 3, 47, 3; 3, 86, 3. *Sallust, Cat.* 33, 1; 58, 3; *Jug.* 85, 49; 102, 5. *Tacitus, Orat.* 1, 4; 18, 1; *Ann.* 14, 43, 1; 14, 54, 1; 16, 31, 1; *Hist.* 1, 11, 1; 1, 83, 2; 2, 76, 6; 4, 65, 2; 4, 73, 4; 4, 73, 6.

Livy, 1, 32, 13; 2, 12, 15; 2, 40, 6; 2, 45, 12; 4, 3, 2; 4, 4, 10; 4, 42, 8; 5, 51, 2; 5, 53, 5; 6, 26, 1; 6, 40, 4; 7, 13, 3; 7, 13, 6; 7, 40, 17 (*bis*); 8, 4, 1; 8, 4, 5; 8, 13, 18; 8, 33, 10; 9, 1, 6; 9, 17, 1; 10, 18, 11.

Plin. Ep. (Teubner), 1, 1, 1; 1, 8, 15; 1, 17, 1; 1, 24, 4; 2, 5, 2; 2, 5, 6; 2, 13, 10; 2, 16, 2; 3, 10, 2; 3, 11, 7; 3, 20, 10; 4, 8, 3; 5, 9, 6; 5, 19, 4; 6, 29, 4; 6, 29, 5; 6, 33, 7; 7, 1, 7; 7, 9, 15; 7, 20, 1; 7, 29, 3; 9, 1, 1; 9, 12, 2; 9, 23, 1; *Paneg.* 4, 1; 4, 4; 4, 5; 16, 4; 21, 3; 28, 1; 32, 1; 46, 5; 78, 1.

Ter. And. 524, 582, 603, 700, 968; *Eun.* 932, 945; *Heaut.* 143, 817, 989; *Phorm.* 505, 830, 836, 905, 910; *Hec.* 471, 545, 580; *Ad.* 225, 986.

2. *Apparent Exceptions.*—Where the principal verb, though in form a past tense, is virtually a present.

Tac. Ann. 4, 8, 8; *Hist.* 1, 16, 1.

Liv. 3, 68, 10; 10, 28, 13.

Plin. Ep. 2, 19, 5; 3, 4, 6; 3, 9, 30; 5, 19, 5; 8, 20, 1; *Paneg.* 45, 5; 46, 7; 90, 3.

Ter. Heaut. 980; *Phorm.* 42, 154.

3. *Real Exceptions.*

(a) *Tac. Ann.* 14, 53, 2.

(*Sall. Jug.* 14, 9.)

(b) *Liv.* 8, 13, 14.

(c and d) *Caes. B.G.* 7, 20, 12.

Tac. Ann. 14, 53, 5; *Hist.* 1, 15, 2; 4, 66, 2.

Liv. 5, 51, 4; 8, 7, 16.

Ter. And. 983; *Eun.* 287, 544, 870; *Phorm.* 240, 647, 779, 979; *Heaut.* 889; *Hec.* 760; *Ad.* 54.

G. S. SALE,

Otago University, New Zealand.

REMARKS ON PROF. SALE'S PAPER ON
SEQUENCE OF TENSES.

THE whole question of 'die sogenannte Consecutio Temporum' (Schmalz) is in so unsettled a state that it would be hazardous to prophesy what form it will ultimately assume. Prof. W. G. Hale of Cornell University has in recent articles in the *American Journal of Philology* (vol. VII. 4, vol. VIII. 1, vol. IX. 2) shown reason for doubting whether what is commonly called 'sequence' is really correctly described by that term. He has made a vigorous attack upon the doctrine that the verb of the subordinate clause takes its tense from the verb of the principal clause, maintaining that the tenses of the subjunctive are not tenseless or semi-tenseless, but have each their proper temporal significance. Thus in *edo ut vivam, edi ut viverem* he would say *vivam* expresses a present purpose, *viverem* a past purpose; and he would see nothing abnormal in *Hic cognosci potuit quantum in bello fortuna possit* (where *potuit* is a tense of past time). In the main it appears to me that Prof. Hale has triumphantly established his point; though I think he goes too far in denying absolutely the existence of a certain formal relation between the tenses of the subordinate and of the principal clauses: his doctrine does not explain how it comes about that we find regularly *novi quid causae fuerit* (not *esset*).

On this far-reaching demand for a revision of the doctrine of sequence Prof. Sale of Dunedin does not touch. Still he does good service in calling attention to a positive defect in the current doctrine, and in claiming such sentences as *Dixi ut scires*, 'I have spoken that you may know,' *Hodie expertus sum quam caduca felicitas esset*, 'I have found out . . . is' as normal Latin. His position seems to me sound, subject to the following limitations:

1. I can see nothing 'exceptional' in *oblitus es quid initio dixerim* where *oblitus es = nescis*. Adopting Prof. Sale's terminology, one might safely lay down the rule that the perfect takes 'primary sequence' in that comparatively small number of instances in which it is equivalent to a present. In the large majority of instances it takes 'historical sequence' even when 'I have—' is demanded in the English translation.

2. Consecutive clauses are by almost universal consent among recent German grammarians excluded from the operation of the law: the tense of the subjunctive being independent of the tense of the principal

clause. So too Dean Bradley (Arnold, § 112).

3. *Ut* and *ne* clauses dependent on perfects of verbs of 'happening' (*factum est, accidit, contigit, evenit*, etc.) should be treated as a special case in which the 'historical sequence' (imperf. subj.) is exclusively used.

E. A. SONNENSCHIEIN.

WHETHER it is desirable in a Latin grammar to make much use of a distinction between tenses which the Romans did not mark is a question fairly arguable. Possibly I have (in my *Grammar*) given too much prominence to the distinction between aorist and perfect. But my § 1510 and the note on p. 194 there referred to were intended to guard against misunderstanding on this point. Indeed I expressly say, almost in Prof. Sale's words, 'The Latin form is really but one tense denoting *past time*.' At any rate Madvig's *Gram.* § 383 and notes show that Prof. Sale's view is not a novelty, though young scholars may perhaps not be the worse for this fresh statement of it. Nor am I prepared to say Prof. Sale's translations may not be justified, though I myself somewhat shrink from emphasizing the present aspect of the imperfect subjunctive by translating *tam carus esset* 'he is so dear,' *rescisceres* 'you have heard of,' *laederetur* 'have been marred,' (*feci ut*) *fierent*, 'are about to take place,' instead of 'attained the result of being so dear,' 'you heard,' 'were marred,' 'have made them take place.' Here, as in the case of conditional subjunctives, I hold that the Latin imperfect subjunctive is primarily a past tense, and I am disposed therefore in translating either to use English past tenses or to use a phrase which may show the dependence of the sentence without putting an undue stress on the extension of this past action or state into the present tense.

H. J. ROBY.

I HESITATE about accepting the view put forward by Prof. Sale and apparently assented to by Mr. Roby, that the Romans were unconscious of a double use attaching to their perfect tense. Are we to consider that they did not distinguish between the instrumental and the locative uses after these had lost their distinctive forms and got merged in the ablative? If we hold, with Mr. Walker, that the early Latin language had separate forms for the completed present and the aorist, the feeling of the distinction was likely to survive in the

grammatical consciousness. At all events it must have revived in later times when all educated Romans became familiar with the two tenses of the Greek, and were forced to find equivalents for them in their translations from Greek into Latin. I do not question that Prof. Sale is right in his contention, that, in sequence on a 'perfect absolute' (completed present), the imperfect subjunctive is more common than the perfect; but it seems to me that this is an irregularity caused by the unfortunate loss of the dis-

tinctive tense-form. The aorist use being more common than the perfect use, the sequence which strictly belonged to the former was extended to the latter by analogy; much in the same way in which an imperfect subjunctive is employed to express present time in the instances quoted by Prof. Sale. Yet no one thinks the Romans were unconscious of the difference between the present and the imperfect tense.

JOSEPH B. MAYOR.

NOTES ON PERSIUS.

ProL. 12: *nummi* is not *money* in general here, but a particular coin, and that a small one; not our American 'Mighty Dollar,' for the point is that one needs to drop but a *trifle* into the slot to set such poets going; render 'nickel' or 'red cent'; cf. 2, 51; 4, 47; 5, 111. In *Juv. 14, 139*, the concrete idea of coin is certainly intended, and perhaps he means that the more dollars your miser has, the more he loves his dimes.

Sat. 1, 41: *an erit qui uelle recuset*.

The independent use of *an* in a rhetorical question appears to be more common than is generally supposed, and than Harper's *Lexicon* would allow. In Ovid, for instance, (to take an author whose use of *an* is entirely unnoticed in the *Lexicon* except in two cases where it is used for *sive*), there are seventy-nine examples of the word in direct questions. Of these fifty-nine are in disjunctive questions, in which the first member is expressed thirty-five times, and omitted (but easily supplied from the context) twenty-four times; in the remaining twenty cases *an* is used independently in a rhetorical question, viz.: (*Riese's text of 1871-74*) *M. 1, 196*; 3, 559; 7, 582; 13, 34. *F. 4, 220*; 6, 35, 39, 524. *T. 2, 4*; 4, 1, 94; 5, 10, 11. *P. 1, 5, 31, 49, 62*; 3, 7, 32. *H. 3, 123*; 8, 17; 9, 147. *A. 1, 7, 29. Sappho. ad Ph. 59*, (cf. an analogous use of *aut* in *P. 3, 2, 21*.)

In Persius *an* occurs fourteen times: in disjunctive questions with the first member expressed five times (2, 19, 26; 3, 27, 61; 5, 155); supplied from the context twice (5, 125; 6, 51); in independent questions seven times (1, 41, 87; 3, 19; 5, 83, 163, 164; 6, 63). In all these last seven cases *an* seems intended to force a conclusion from the foregoing (Gildersleeve), but it would perhaps be difficult to find any such connec-

tion in the following passages from Ovid, viz.: *M. 1, 196*; 3, 559; 13, 34; *F. 4, 219*; *Sapph. ad Ph. 59*.

Sat. 1, 101: *lynxem Maenas flexura corymbis*.

Conington (cf. the Schol.), rendering *corymbis* 'ivy branches,' supposed that reins of ivy are meant, and cited Verg. *Aen. 6, 804*. But *corymbus* means a *cluster* of ivy. Bacchantes and ivy at once suggest the thyrsus, which was frequently tipped with an ivy cluster. The striking Pompeian fresco of a Bacchante urging on a Centaur with such a thyrsus (*Pitt. Ant. d'Ercolano, i. p. 135*) explains, to me at least, the thought of Persius. See also a bas-relief in the British Museum, figured in Sandys' *Bacchae*, p. 85, although the thyrsus in this appears to be tipped with a fir-cone.

2, 20: Gildersleeve thinks that if Staius is an average man, Jones, then the choice is, 'which of the two, Jones or Jupiter?' He cites Cic. *Att. 16, 14, 1*; *Fam. 7, 3, 1*; and Caes. *B. G. 5, 44* to prove that *quis* may be used for *uter*; but these are all 'indirect questions.' A better example had been Tac. *A. 1, 47, quos* (of two) *igitur anteferebat?* a direct question in indirect form. But Gildersleeve's premise seems not necessary; the idea is 'Staius? Why not Staius? Who makes a better judge?'

2, 55: *hinc illud subiit*: this example is not given either by Neue or Lachmann (*Lucr. 3, 1042*) in their collections of similar long ultimae. It would fall among those which may be accounted for by the following caesura.

2, 69: *dicite, pontifices, in sacro quid facit aurum?* Here for *sacro* the cod. Mp. 212 with eight others has *sco*; nine have *sacro*; the rest *sancto*, which is printed in Jahn ('43 and '68), Bücheler, Conington, and

Gildersleeve. The old editions had *sacro*, which I prefer because (1) there are plenty of examples of its use for *templum* (see the *Lex.*), and I find none of *sanctum* in that sense except in Christian writers and the Vulgate; (2) *sacer* properly signifies a place consecrated to a divinity (*ἱερός*), while *sanctus* is any place which must not be disturbed (*ἅγιος*); so every *sacer locus* is also *sanctus*, but the converse does not hold good; (3) Persius uses *sanctus* just below in vs. 73; (4) he uses *sacra*, *sacro*, *sacras* with the first syllable long once each, and once *sacrum* with the first syllable short.

5, 103: *navem si poscat sibi peronatus arator, luciferi rudis.*

The editors here object that a ploughman who didn't know the stars would be ignorant of his own trade, and quote Hesiod and Vergil to prove it. But Persius wasn't thinking of the gentleman farmer for whom those poets wrote; he wants to make his ploughman as ignorant as possible: 'suppose a clodhopper in cowhides, who didn't know what the Morning Star was, should want to be pilot?' None but slaves were ploughmen in Persius' time.

6, 27: *ast uocat officium.*

Under the word *at* in Harper's *Lexicon* it is stated, as on the authority of Jahn, that Persius used only the form *ast*, never *at*.

As a matter of fact, Jahn's own index shows twelve instances of *at*, and but three of *ast*. (The *Lex.* further states that *ast* is found in old laws, but omits to say that in them it frequently means *and if*; cf. F. D. Allen, *Remnants of Early Latin*, nos. 166, 185, 205). Besides the above passage, Persius used *ast* in S. 2, 39 and 6, 74, in both these places before vowels. In fact, L. Müller (*d. r. m.* p. 394) pointed out that this was the regular rule in the classic poets; he found but seven instances (besides ours), in which *ast* stood before a consonant. From these the new edition of Juvenal (Bücheler) strikes out S. 14, 216, on account of lack of MS. evidence, leaving no instance in satire except the one before us. I may remark that this also was avoided by the reading in cod. Mp. 115 (= cod. P. of Juvenal), *avocat* or *advocat*; it is true, however, that the same hand corrected this for the usual reading. I should be inclined to restore *advocat officium* here, meaning 'a case of charity calls for my help,' could I find an example of the 'absolute' use of the word in this sense. The omission of *at* would be no objection (cf. 6, 64, *deest aliquid summae*), nor do I feel that Juvenal's *si uocat officium* (3, 239) makes it impossible to believe that Persius used *advocat*.

MORRIS H. MORGAN.
Harvard University.

OLD-LATIN PALIMPSEST OF THE ACTS AND APOCALYPSE.

In his careful notice of Mr. White's Munich Latin Gospels in the *Classical Review* for December Dr. T. K. Abbott calls attention to M. Omont's publication of the contents of two palimpsest leaves from an Old-Latin Apocalypse in 1883, and his expressed intention of performing the same office for ten similar leaves from the Acts, all forming part of a MS. in the National Library at Paris. It is hardly surprising that even so well informed a scholar as Dr. Abbott has overlooked two articles on the same twelve leaves by the late Augustus Van Sittart, buried as they are in old volumes of the *Journal of Philology* (ii. 240 ff. [1869]; iv. 219 ff. [1872]). Having been asked by me to look for the MS. from which Sabatier had printed Old-Latin readings of Acts iii and iv, Mr. Van Sittart succeeded with M. Claude's help in finding their source in 'Lat. 6400 G' of the National Library. On his first visit

he deciphered twelve more or less complete pages of the Acts, from which he published a copious selection of various readings; and subsequently he added a transcript of three pages of the Apocalypse. In the table of notation for newly discovered Old-Latin MSS. at p. 5 of the Appendix to W. H., *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, I included this Paris MS. under the two heads *Acts (African)* and *Apocalypse (African)* in the following shape, 'h Fragmenta Regia, V or VI: Van Sittart': and h is cited in the notes on Apoc. i. 5, 20; and ought to have been added to g in the note on viii. 13. The 'African' character of the text is likewise mentioned in §116 of the Introduction. The fourth page of the Apocalypse 'seemed' to Mr. Van Sittart 'hopeless: at least,' he said, 'it must be left for sharper eyes, assisted it may be by photography.' Of this page M. Omont says 'scriptura pene

omnino deleta est et lectu difficillima: photographica tamen arte adhibita pars legi potuit'; and accordingly we are indebted to him for the greater part of the contents, as also for a few additional syllables of the other pages. But the continuous text of the Acts, as far as I know, has not yet appeared.

As regards the class of Latin biblical MSS. to which the Codex Monacensis should be assigned, I may be allowed to express full concurrence in Dr. Abbott's implied approval of Mr. White's results (p. 313, col. 2), which at once confirm and limit the ascription of this MS. to the 'Italian' class by Tischendorf (N. T. of 1859, p. cexlv), Dr. Westcott (*Dict. of Bible* [1863] iii. 1694) and myself. Previous to Mr. White's publication the only accessible evidence as

to the MS., in addition to Tischendorf's brief description, consisted in his citation of its testimony for Greek variants, the Latin being added for a few words and phrases only. Thus what happened to be known of the MS. till about a year ago was precisely that element of it which Mr. White has now verified as 'Italian.' Nearly all the Latin text was unpublished, and it is in the Latinity that Mr. White finds no considerable departure from the 'European' standards. What Mr. White has virtually proved is this, that an 'Italian' reviser, in doctoring a 'European' Latin text, might sometimes be content to introduce the changes needed to produce correspondence with a fresh Greek text, without going on to polish or otherwise alter the Latinity.

F. J. A. HORT.

NOTES UPON GREEK MANUSCRIPTS IN ITALIAN LIBRARIES.

MODENA.

In the spring of this year (1888) I visited Modena for the purpose of collating two MSS. of the Homeric Hymns which were known to exist there; and the interest of the collection generally induced me to inspect the other Greek MSS. preserved in the Regia Biblioteca Estense. To these two tasks I was able to give from February 27 to March 10: and while I plead the exigencies of time in excuse for the deficiencies of this catalogue, I am the more bound to acknowledge the courtesy of Signor Luigi Rossi, librarian of the Estense, and his most obliging assistant, to whose kindness I owe the bare possibility of covering so large a collection in so short a time. The history of the Estense collection yet remains to be written: for whoever should attempt it a first requisite would be the examination of the extensive series of Latin and Mediaeval MSS.—a task which lay outside my sphere; the main outlines, on the other hand, are well known. A convenient and continuous account is contained in a publication issued by the authorities of the library in 1873, entitled *Cenni storici della Biblioteca Estense in Modena: con appendice di documenti*. Modena. Tipogr. Capelli, 1873. The basis of this is a history of the library written by Antonio Lombardi (librarian from 1814-47) and preserved in manuscript. It adds however nothing of moment to what was already to be found in Tiraboschi (e.g. *Storia della Lett. Ital.* ed. 1823, V. 167, 8,

VII. 36-48, 216-18). It appears probable that a collection of books existed at the court of the Marchesi d'Este at Ferrara as early as the twelfth century; the first mentions of Greek manuscripts occur in two documents adduced on p. vi. n. of *Cenni Storici*: one, a catalogue of 1436, gives two Greek MSS., the other of 1467 gives four. But in the province of Greek the collection will have been scanty till the time of the Duke Alfonso II. whose reign began in 1559. Letters of the years 1560 and 1561, from the ambassador at Venice, Girolamo Falletti, relative to the ordering and purchase of MSS., are given in Tiraboschi, *Stor. d. Lett. It.* ed. 1791, VII. p. 229, and it is easy to recognise in the numerous MSS. written in Venice about the year 1560, especially by Andreas Darmarius (see *Index*), some of the books thus ordered by Alfonso. In his reign also, it is natural to assume that the large portion of the library of Alberto Pio of Carpi came into the Estense, soon to migrate to within a few miles of its old resting-place. The transference of the court and library from Ferrara to Modena took place in 1598; and from that time no material additions in the way of Greek appear to have been made (a donation of 329 MSS. among which are some in Greek, in 1805, is mentioned on p. xxxiii.). After suffering many vicissitudes of situation within the ducal palace, the library was lately moved to a convenient set of rooms

in the Albergo Arti, at the west end of the town. The MS. catalogue of Greek manuscripts now in use is based upon a fuller catalogue made by the Abbate Gabardi, vice-librarian from 1780 to 1790.

In Documento I. of *Cenni Storici*, under the head of 'Codici Greci,' is a useful but not exhaustive list of the more valuable Greek MSS. in the library. I have compared my notes carefully with this catalogue, but even after a second visit to Modena there remain a good many points of divergence; these I have been careful to note where they occur.

One of the most interesting portions of the collection is that which was, as I have already stated, once in the possession of Alberto Pio, count of Carpi, and which itself was in great measure composed of the library of Giorgio Valla of Piacenza. For this celebrated person it may be sufficient to refer to the short account in Tiraboschi, *Storia d. Lett. Ital.* ed. 1823, p. 1564 sq., and for Pio to the *Biblioteca Modenese* IV. p. 156 sq.¹ The question of the way in which so large a part of Pio's library entered the Estense must be held to be still unsolved, in spite of the ingenious hypothesis of the author of *Cenni storici*, p. xiv. note. Two MSS. now in the Estense can be identified as having formed part of the library of Cardinal Rodolfo Pio, nephew of Alberto: viz. the MS. of Epictetus, now numbered II. A. 10 (see Upton's *Epict.* London, 1741—not 1739—praef., printed at length in Tiraboschi, *Bibl. Mod.* l.c.) seen in the year 1548, and the Clement III. D. 7, which Petrus Victorius in the preface to the edition of 1550 says he used in constructing his text: it had been lent to Marcellus Cervinus by 'Rodolphus Pius antistes Carpensis—e bibliotheca quam a majoribus suis doctissimis viris ac maximis virtutibus insignibus accepit.'² It is to be hoped that documentary evidence still exists, and will be produced,

¹ The history of one of Valla's most famous MSS. (not to be found in the Estense) is traced by Heiberg, *Philologus*, vol. xlii. p. 421 sq. A list of some of his MSS. seen by Janus Lascaris at Venice is given from Vat. graec. 1412 by Müller, *Centralbl. f. Bibliothekswesen* I. p. 333 sq. I regret not to have seen an article by the librarian Cavedoni on the collections of Valla and Pio, in the *Memorie di Religione, di Morale e di Letteratura*, ser. iii. tom. xvii. p. 212, Modena, 1854.

² It is true that Cavedoni, ap. Clem. Alex. ed. Dindorf, Oxon. 1869, praef. p. vii., thought that another MS. of Clement was here in question; but the number of early MSS. of Clement is not large, and the absence of Pio's *ex-libris* so easily accounted for that, till more decisive evidence is forthcoming, the Modena MS. may be taken to be that used by Vettori.

of the entry of these and other books into the Estense. For those of the MSS. of Valla and Pio that found their way into other collections, there is a tolerably clear chain of evidence: cf. Ambrogio Morando praef. to *August. Steuchii opera*. Venet. 1591, Card. Stefano Borgia, *Anecd. Litter.* Romae, 1773, ap. Tiraboschi, *Bibl. Mod.* l.c. and Nohac, *Fulvio Orsini*, p. 168, note.

The Estense as it stands contains 253 Greek manuscripts; I have here mentioned only such of them as appeared of interest, whether literary or palaeographical; two omissions however have been made of somewhat greater extent—the commentators on Aristotle (*paene innumeri* as Montfaucon found them, *Diar. Ital.* p. 33), which I am glad to leave in the hands of Professor Vitelli of Florence, and a number of sixteenth-century copies of minor medical works of Galen and Hippocrates. These and other codices will be included in the long-intended printed catalogue of the Biblioteca Estense which all scholars must hope may soon be given to the world.³

It is convenient to add here a note upon the library of Reggio in Emilia. It is well known that the celebrated library of the monastery of Santo Spirito has recently been incorporated with the Biblioteca Municipale. The authorities there allowed me to inspect the MS. catalogue of the S. Spirito library, although, as they informed me, the ecclesiastical books from it had by agreement been given to the Chapter Library in Reggio. The only titles however in the catalogue that had a Greek look were 'Tatianus contra Graecos, grece MS.' and 'Athenagoras in 4to MS.': these books were not to be found, but on looking at the catalogue of the Bibl. Estense, I soon identified them with MS. No. 247, once the property of Giovanni Francesco Pico della Mirandola. In the Biblioteca Municipale at Reggio are late MSS. of the following Latin authors—Ovid, Propertius, Terence and Probus.

1. (ii. A. 1) EVANGELISTERIUM: membr. 7 x 5 in. ff. circ. 150, 20 ll. on page, saec. x. exeunt. Small minuscule mostly below line. Illuminated.

2. (ii. A. 2) MISCELL. AGAPETUS DIAC. AD JUSTIN., LUCIANI SOLOECISTA, JOANN. BOTANIOTAE CARMINA, PSELLUS DE DIV. MYST. etc.: chart. 7 x 5 in. ff. circ. 200, saec. xv.—xvi. On f. 9 vers. ἡ παρούσα βίβλος θεοῦ εὐτοία ἐστὶν ἐμοῦ τοῦ θεολογῆτον.

³ I have not thought it necessary to refer to the accounts given of the Estense by successive travellers from Montfaucon downwards; but it is interesting to find in a ms. book of D'Orville's possessed by the Bodleian (D'Orv. x. 2, 4, 31), a 'recensio bibliothecae Mutinensis' made by himself.

5. (ii. A. 5) EVANGELIA QUATTUOR: membr. $6\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ in. ff. 225, 20 lines on f., saec. xv.: in archaising hand, copied from exemplar resembling cod. 1. In perfect preservation.

6. (ii. A. 6) ANONYMI LOCI COMMUNES, arranged under headings: chart. $5\frac{3}{4} \times 4$ in. saec. xv.-xvi. Small and faded hand.

9. (ii. A. 9) EVANGELIA: membr. $6 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ in. saec. xiii.—xiv., unpagcd. At end: *πλήρωσας εἰπον δέξα σοι ὁ θεὸς ἀμήν*.

10. (ii. A. 10) ARRIAN DISS. EPICT. (ff. 1-333) TIM. LOCR. DE NAT. MUND. (ff. 336-368): chart. 6×4 in. ff. 369, 21 ll. on f., saec. xv. (circ. 1484). On f. 333 vers. subscription to Arrian, *πεπλήρωται σύνθεσις τὰ τοῦ ἀρριανοῦ τῶν ἐπικτῆτου διατριβῶν*. At end, on fly-leaf, *Liber hic scriptus ē manu clarissimi viri dñi Matthaei camarioti constantinopolitani: quem mihi dono dedit Anno dñi M^occē Lxxviii praeceptor ille optimus*. Last three words in a different hand, and there follows an erasure of three or four words more. Below, on same page, crossed out, *Γεωργίου τοῦ βάλλα ἔστι τὸ βιβλίον*. No trace of Alberto Pio, but the front fly-leaves are perished. Cf. Arrian diss. epict. ed. Upton, London. 1741 praef. and Tiraboschi Bibl. Moden. iv. p. 162, whence the incorrect form *Camarottus* has found its way into Gardthausen. (The note is not, as is stated in 'Cenni Storici,' written in Greek.)

11. (ii. A. 11) EROTEMATA CHRYSOLORAE: membr. $5\frac{1}{2} \times 3\frac{3}{4}$ in. ff. 100, 13 ll. on page. F. 84 v. τῷ συντελεσθῇ τῶν καλῶν θεῷ χάρις ματθαίος σεβαστὸς λαμπούδης ὁ πελοποννήσιος.

12. (ii. A. 12) S. MAXIMUS DE CARITATE, etc.: membr. $5\frac{1}{2} \times 4$ in. ff. 135, 26 ll., small minuscule below the line, saec. xi.-xii. Written by two hands, the first of which is upright and handsome, and largely influenced by tachygraphy: the second, from f. 57 rect., is far more frequently abbreviated, but follows the ordinary system. At the end, four pp. of rude xii.—xiii. saec. hand, written on apparently ancient uncial palimpsest of Epistles.

17. (iii. A. 2) chart. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. ff. 70, 18 ll. to p., A.D. 1469, contains ARISTOPHANES' PLUTUS, begins at v. 218 (ff. 1-29r.); NUBES (30r.—70r.), with glosses and a few marginal scholia.

subscriptions: f. 29 v., end of Plutus: *ἐπληροῦθι τὸ μέσον τοῦ βιβλίου ἐν μὲνι μαρτίῳ 5 ὥρα εἰ τοῦ ἔτους 5 τοῦ 1469.*

f. 70 v. beside prayers etc., *ἐτελειώθη τῷ παρῶν βιβλίον ἐν μὲνι μαρτίῳ 15 ὥρα 15 5 τοῦ 1469 β τέλους εἰληφέν πυκτὴν τέρμα τοῦ θεοδώρου ἐτελειώθη ὑπαρκοῦσα δέλτος καὶ βιβλίον καμοῦ τοῦ θεωδωρου.* at the bottom a monocondylion.

It appears therefore that the *Clouds* took ten days in writing.

19. (iii. A. 5) chart. 8×6 in. saec. xv.-xvi. Contains different books: (1) Io. CHRYSOST. LITURGIA, Greek and Latin; (2) in Latin: RITUS MISSAE CALDEORUM MARONITARUM AB AMBROSIO TRANSLATI: subscription: 'Laelius Gassus xxiii. Augusti MDxvii.' (3) ARMENIAN MISSAL: a subscription in Latin, with date mcccē 19, oct. 24, by David Bishop of the Armenians who are in Cyprus (seen by Montfaucon. l.c. p. 31 'codex recens liturgiarum Graecae etc.')

21. (iii. A. 7) VARIA GRAMMATICA: chart. 8×6 in. ff. 62, 24 ll on p. At beginning, 'Αλβέρτου πλου καρπαίων ἀρχοντος κτῆμα: on f. 21 v. (blank), γεώργιος οὐάλλα πλακεντίνος ἔγραψε: a hand, app. Valla's own, has altered οὐάλλα into βάλλας. The same subscription recurs on ff. 30 v., 38r: at the end γεώργιος ὁ βάλλας πλακεντίνος ἐξέγραψε ἐαυτῷ καὶ τοῖς φίλοις κοινὰ γὰρ τὰ τῶν φίλων ὡς πωλάδης παρὰ τῷ εὐρεπίδῃ ἔφη.

22. (iii. A. 8) GRAMMATICA: chart. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 6$ in. ff. 98, 24ll.

ff. 1-72 HELIODORUS IN DIONYSII ARTEM.

73-83 GREG. CORINTH. DE DIALECTIS.

84-97 ANON. DE DECLINAT. NOMINUM MASC.

23. (iii. A. 9) SIMEON THESSALONICENSIS, NICOLAUS CABASILAS, DE MUSICA: chart. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. ff. 95, 22ll. saec. xv.

24. (iii. A. 10) ASTRONOMICA, PROCLUS, PHILOPONUS: chart. unpagcd, $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. saec. xv. Extensive notes, marginal and at end, in Valla's hand.

26. (iii. A. 12) CONST. LASCARIS ALII GRAMMAT. chart. 8×5 in. ff. circ. 50. saec. xv: in various hands. Notes and extracts in Valla's hand. At end on flyleaf: *Γεωργίου τοῦ βάλλα τὸ βιβλίον.*

(Librarian's note on a loose slip said the book belonged to Alberto Pio, but I could not find the evidence.)

27. (iii. A. 13) ARISTOPHANIS PLUTUS (ff. 1-52), NUBES (54-114): chart. $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. ff. 114, 12ll. saec. xv. Interlinear glosses. Nubes begin at v. 50: f. 52 τέλος τοῦ πρώτου, f. 114 τέλος τῶν δύο δραμάτων.

28. (iii. A. 14) ARISTOPHANIS PLUTUS (ff. 3-43), NUBES (45-97): chart. $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. ff. 100, quaternions numbered at front, 14 ll. Interlinear glosses and considerable scholia.

Subscriptions: at beginning τοῦ ἐπιφανοῦς ἀρχοντος ἀλβέρτου πλου τὸ βιβλίον. f. 2 vers. δημητρίου καὶ εὐφημίας: τοῦ πανιδιώτου. at end: *Γεωργίου τοῦ βάλλα ἔστι τὸ βιβλίον.*

31. (iii. A. 17) chart. $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. ff. 9, 21 ll. mutilated at end.

Contains ff. 1-19 CHION. EPISTOLAE.

21-27 MUSAETUS HERO AND LEANDER.

29-91 Prolegomena to ARISTOPHANES and scholia to PLUT. and NUBES. Librarian's note ascribes the collection to Musurus. Note on f. 33r. *eis τὴν γέννησιν τῆς θεοῦ ἀφικόμενον ὄδον.*

33. (iii. A. 19) GEORG. CODINUS, NICEPHORUS CALLIXTUS, HISTORICA. chart 8×5 in. ff. circ. 70, 22 ll. a. 1541. At end: *ἐτελειώθη τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον διὰ χειρὸς ἐμοῦ νυκολ. βαρέλη ἔτι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν σάρκον οἰκονομίας τοῦ κυρ. ἡμῶν τῷ χυ ἀφμα ἐν μηνὶ νοεμβρίῳ λ' α' 1541*, perhaps a brother of Basilius Varelia, of whose writing a specimen is given by M. Omont (Fac-similés des MSS. grecs &c. 1887): cf. Legrand, Bibliographie Hellénique i. p. 273, and see MS. No. 108: the book may perhaps have been written at Venice.

34. (iii. A. 20) chart. $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in. ff. circ. 80. saec. xv.

THEOCRITUS (part) inc. II. v. 11.

PHILOSTRATUS IMAGINES.

PINDAR OL. (part).

36. (iii. A. 22) S. JOANN. DAMASC. DE FIDE ORTHODOXA: membr. 8×5 in. ff. 24, 29 ll. saec. xii. (not xiii. as Catalogue): small handsome minuscule.

In the middle of this are stuck, loose, 10 leaves of a vellum MS., 7×5 in. saec. perh. xi.: said in the Catalogue to be Ammonius on Porphyry's Isagoge: but to judge from the contents, part of an astronomical treatise by a Christian. Perhaps the last quinion of some MS.

37. (iii. A. 23) PSALTER. Membr. 7×5 in. ff. circ. 200, 13 ll. Large archaising hand, saec. xv. not, as Cat., x. Illuminations in the early style.

At beginning 'Αλβέρτου πλου καρπαίων ἀρχοντος κτῆμα.

38. (ii. B. 1) ARISTOT. ETHICS. Chart. $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6$ in. ff. 99, 12 quaternions + 3, signed front and back, saec. xv.: well written, marginal notes. At beginning 'Αλβέρτου πλου καρπαίων ἀρχοντος κτῆμα. 'Olim Georgii Vallae,' Catalogue; but I did not find the inscription. Late note at beginning 'Aristotelis Eth. Nic. libri x. eum aliquot Pottillii marginalibus.'

39. (ii. B. 2) chart. $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in. ff. 215, quaternions

numbered back and front, 25 ll.: in different hands.

Contains: ff. 1—49 PHALARIDIS EPP.

51—62 BRUTI EPP.

63—67 DION. HAL. IUDIC. DE ANTI. SCRIPTT.

70—100 NICANDRI THERIACA, with scholia.

101—132 ORPHEI ARGONAUTICA.

134—215 SOPHOCLES ANTIGONE, with interlinear glosses.

At beginning ἀλβέρτου πίου καρπαίων ἄρχοντος κτῆμα, here, and at end, Γεωργίου τοῦ βάλλα ἐστὶ τὸ βιβλίον.

40. (ii. B. 3) VARIORUM COMM. IN PTOLEMAEUM, PAULUS ALEX. DE GEN. MUNDI: chart. 9 × 6 in., gatherings of 14 numbered in front.

At beginning τοῦ ἐπιφανοῦς ἄρχοντος ἀλβέρτου τὸ βιβλίον.

At end Γεωργίου τοῦ βάλλα ἐστὶ τὸ βιβλίον.

41. (ii. B. 4) SCHOLIA TO SOPHOCLES: chart. 8 × 6 in. ff. 199, saec. xv.: well written and preserved.

44. (ii. B. 7) ANON. GRAMMATICA, PHOCYLIDES τὰ λεγόμενα ἀργυρά: chart. 9 × 5½ in. ff. circ. 50, 27 ll. After Phocylides, besides a monocondylion ending in ἀμήν, the date ἔτους 5 τ ξ ρ, i.e. 1455: the third figure is erased but probably 5.

45. (ii. B. 8) DION. AREOP. DE COELESTI HIERARCH. etc. with lexicon to words in Dio: chart. 8½ × 6 in. ff. 155, 24 ll. saec. xv.

On blank leaf at end: μὴν ὀκτωβρ. 5 ἐμάθαμεν πῶς ἐπιάσα(ν) τὰ δύο καράβια τὰ βενετικά οἱ(ι) φούσεις εἰς τὰ στροφάδια.

46. (ii. B. 9) NICEPH. BLEMMIDA, FRAGMENT ON LOGIC, PLAT. PHAEDO, THEOPHRASTUS τῶν μετὰ τὰ φυσικά, PROCLUS ON EUCLID: chart. saec. xv. 8½ × 5, written by different hands.

47. (ii. B. 10) THEODORI GAZAE ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΙΚΗΣ ΕΙΣΑΓΩΓΗΣ libri iv.: chart. xv. saec. 8 × 7, ff. 133, quinions.

49. (ii. B. 12) MATTHAEUS CAMARIOTUS, GRAMMAR: εἰσαγωγὴ εἰς τὴν γραμματικὴν ἐπιτομώτερον ἐκδοθεῖσα καὶ σαφέστερον ὑπὸ τοῦ σοφωτάτου καὶ λογιωτάτου κυρίου μαρθαίου τοῦ καμαριώτου: chart. saec. xv. 8½ × 5½, 24 ll. ff. 54.

On last page, Γεωργίου τοῦ βάλλα ἐστὶ τὸ βιβλίον.

I could not find the name of 'Giorgio Virgizio Ritimneo', who is said in the 'Cenni Storici' to have been the first possessor of this MS.¹ He would doubtless be a member of the family of the well-known Angelus Vergecius.

51. (ii. B. 14) ARATUS PHAENOMENA (ff. 1—53), HOMERI HYMNI XII. (55—64), HESIOD THEOGON. (65—99), HES. SCUTUM HER. (100—117), LYCOPHR. ALEX. (118—189), PINDAR OL. NEM. (190—264): chart. xv. ff. 264, 8½ × 6.

At beginning and end, repeated, the names of Valla and Alberto Pio: Valla's name is crossed out where it first occurs, the second inscription relating to Alberto takes this form—ἀλβέρτου πίου κρατούντος κάρπου καὶ σοφωτάτου ἐστὶ τὸ βιβλίον.

This MS. is known as J. among the MSS. of the Homeric Hymns: see the edition of Abel (Prag, 1885), or that now forthcoming by Prof. A. Goodwin, for which the MS. has been recollated.

53. (iii. B. 1) ARISTOPHANES, PLUTUS (ff. 2—56), CLOUDS (58—116): chart. saec. xv. ff. 121, 11 ll., 9 × 6, quaternions numbered on first f. These are scholia and interlinear glosses.

54. (iii. B. 2) PLUTARCH APOPHTH. LAC., ARIST. ΠΕΡΙ ΑΡΕΤΗΣ, EPISTLES OF DIOGENES CYN., CRATES, CHION, ANACHARSIS, APOLLONIUS, HIPPOCRATES, al.: chart. xv. 8½ × 5½, begins with 11th quaternion.

¹ I see that ms. Vat. Pal. 90 belonged to him:—Γεωργίου τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ Βεργίτζου (Stevenson.)

At end: γεωργίου τοῦ βάλλα ἐστὶ τοῦτο βιβλίον, and there are marginalia in his hand. Beneath is pasted a strip of paper bearing the words τοῦ ἐπιφανοῦς ἄρχοντος ἀλβέρτου πίου τὸ βιβλίον, perhaps taken from the front fly-leaves, now lost.

55. (iii. B. 3) SYNESIUS, EPP., EUNAPIUS, LIBANIUS, ORATT., GEORG. LECAPENUS, ANDRONIC. ZARIDAS, EPP.: chart. xiv. 8 × 6, ff. circ. 300, 40 ll., written in a small hand. f. 81, at the end of Synesius, γεωργίου τοῦ βάλλα τὸ βιβλίον, crossed out, and beneath, ἀλβέρτου πίου ἄρχοντος καρπαίων τὸ βιβλίον. Valla's subscription recurs at the end of Andronicus Zaridas. I did not see either of the inscriptions given in 'Cenni Storici', one of which, of the year 1372, makes the monk Theophanes owner of the book, but they may well be there. There are several erased subscriptions. (Montfaucon, l.c. p. 32).

56. (iii. B. 4) NICOMED. GERAS. INSTIT. ARIST., EUCLID ELEM.: chart. xiv. 8½ × 5. I did not find the names of Valla and Alberto, given in 'Cenni Storici'.

57. (iii. B. 5) CONSTANT. LASCARIS, DE NOMINE ET VERBO lib. tertius, DE SYNTAXI lib. sec. (ff. 2—49): GREG. CYPRIUS SERMON ON S. GEORGE, GEMIST. PLETHO extr. from Strabo: chart. xv. 8½ × 5½. F. 49r. in the same hand as text: ΚΩΝΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΣ ΣΥΝΕΤΑΞΕΝ ΕΝ ΜΕΣΣΗ ΕΤΕΙ ΑΠὸ ΘΕΟΥΝΙΑΣ ΑΘΕΞ, τὰ δὲ ἐπόμενα εἰσὶν ἐν τῷ τετυπωμένῳ πρώτῳ. On the last f. but one, in a nearly illegible hand, ΕΤΕΙ 5 Τ Ζ [1482] ΜΑΡΤΙΟ Ι ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΥΙΟΣ ΜΟΥ ΡΗΣΩΣΙΛΙΝΙΟΣ (?). At beg. and end Valla's usual signature, crossed out at beg.: at beg. Pio's. The MS. may apparently be dated between the years 1476, that of the first edition of Lascaris' Grammar, and 1482: cf. Legrand, Bibl. Hell. i. pp. 1 and 15, and the colophon to the edition of 1490 given on page 16. I regret that I have no note as to whether, as the writer of 'Cenni Storici' asserts, the first part of the MS. is written by Valla.

58. (iii. B. 6) MOSCHOPULUS, THEODOS., PSELLUS al. gram.: chart. 8½ × 5½, in various hands, a. 1449.

At end: εἰς αὐτὸ ἐγράφη τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον.

At beg.: τοῦ πολυκράτους ἀλβέρτου κτῆμα. No mention of Valla.

59. (iii. B. 7) VARIORUM GRAMMATICA ET RHETORICA, LUCIAN. DIAL. II., THEOPH. CHARACT. etc.: chart. xv. 8 × 6, ff. circ. 200, in various hands.

At beg. Valla's inscription, crossed out, at end that of Alberto Pio.

60. (iii. B. 8) PENTECOSTARIUM, chart. xv. 8½ × 5½, 24 ll.

At beg. τὸ παρὸν πεντηκοστάριον, ἐνε μοῦ Ἰαχαρίου τοῦ μέγα μύνην.

At the end are inserted 29 ff. of another MS. larger in size, being part of a Pentecostarium or Synaxarium, as a librarian's note in MS. says.

61. (iii. B. 9) VARIA MEDICA, chart. xv. 8½ × 6, ff. 97, quaternions, 22 ll., all in one hand.

At beg. τοῦ ἐπιφανοῦς ἄρχοντος ἀλβέρτου τὸ βιβλίον; the writer of this inscription, evidently Pio's librarian, has here and in many other books added a table of contents. At end, Valla's usual signature.

62. (iii. B. 10) CONSTANT. HARMENOPULUS, alii iuristici, chart. 8½ × 5, ff. circ. 200, a. 1393.

At end: ἐτελείωθη τὸ παρὸν μὴν ἰουλα. κδ ινθ. 5 ἔτους 5 τ α.

Below this, in another hand, a subscription illegible but evidently the same as that on the next blank page but one, viz.:—

εἰς ἀφεα [1561] μὴν Γεναρίου 5 Ν ιβ ἀγόρασα τοῦτο βιβλίον ἀπὸ τὸν αὐχῶνα ἐγὼ ἀντώνιος καλοῦσιν υἱός

τοῦ πα[τρὸς] γεωργίου καλοσύνα. In Latin: Anto. calossina fies (!) pap (sic) calossi. There follow some more dates in different hands.

63. (iii. B. 11) DION. PERIEGET., AELIAN VAR. HIST., HESIOD. OP. DL., THEOGNIS, γνωμολογία, HOMERI BATRACHOMYOMACHIA (15 pages from a printed book): chart. xv. ff. circ. 200.

68. (ii. C. 1) DION. HAL. DE DEMOSTH. SING. VI DICEND., AD AMMAEUM, AD CN. POMP., DE THUO. HIST. IUDIC.: chart. xv.-xvi. 10 x 7: well preserved, but mut. at beginning, and with many lacunas in the text.

70. (ii. C. 3) CHRYSOSTOM OFUSCULA, chart. 9½ x 6, xv.

At beginning: τοῦ ἀντωνίου σκελον τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον.

Beneath: γεωργίου τοῦ βάλλα τοῦτο τὸ βιβλίον ἐστὶ.

At top of text: ἀλβέρτου πίου καρπαίων ἄρχοντος κτήμα.

On last f.: Ant. panormita.

71. (ii. C. 4) SYNAXARIUM. Membr. 9½ x 7, 2 columns, ff. circ. 300, quaternions signed back and front, saec. xi. A flowing minuscule hand below the line, text a good deal abbreviated, many marginal notes in contemporary hand. Stichometrical notes. On a blank page facing the text are some verses in uncial, the first of which runs γέγραφα δέλω γεωργίος ἀχρεῖος.

72. (ii. C. 5) BASILII ALIORUMQUE HOMILIAE. Membr. xi. 9½ x 7, ff. circ. 200, quaternions signed back and front, 24 ll. Fluent minuscules below the line.

73. (ii. C. 6) EVANGELISTARIUM. Uncial, app. of the early xth century. Membr. 9½ x 6, ff. 292, 21 ll. Thick vellum, letters upright and square, upon the line. Gatherings of 8, unsigned, ruled on the hair side. Corrections and marginal notes in various hands, uncial and minuscule. Breathings &c. in red. From the form of the letters one would be inclined with Montfaucon (Diar. Ital. p. 31), to put the MS. in the viiih century, but a reference in the Calendar (first found by the librarian Cavedoni) to the death of a wife of Leo VI. (a. 892) seems decisive for the later date.

74. (ii. C. 7) EUCHOLOGIUM FOR MARCH, APRIL, MAY. Membr. 9½ x 7, ff. circ. 300, 32 ll. saec. x.-xi. Good medium-sized minuscule, usually below the line, but sometimes above or cut by it.

Under the date April 7, τι αὐτὶ ἡμέρα ἐκυμῖθι θεοδόρος.

75. (ii. C. 8) VARIA GRAMMATICA ET RHETORICA, including ISOCRATES AD DEM. ET NICOCL., and LYSIAS' EPITAPHIUS: chart. xv. 9½ x 6½, ff. circ. 100, 24 ll. in various hands: at the end of a Summary of Hephæstion, γεώργιος ὁ βάλλα πλακεντίνας ἔγραψε. At beg. Alberto Pio's name, at the end Valla's.

76. (ii. C. 9) ARISTOTLE OPERA VARIA MINORA, PACHYMERES QUAEST. MECHAN.: chart. xv. 9 x 6½, 22 ll. f. circ. 100. Said in 'Cenni Storici' to be written by Michael Suliardus, but the subscription escaped me; cf. No. 85. Alberto Pio's name at the beginning, no trace of Valla's.

77. (ii. C. 10) SCHOLIA TO APOLL. RHOD.: chart. xv. 9½ x 6½, ff. 143, quinions signed back and front: on the second fly-leaf, γεωργίου τοῦ βάλλα ἐστὶ τὸ βιβλίον, and there are notes in his hand. No sign of Pio's name.

82. (iii. C. 3) GEORGIUS CYPRIUS EPIST.: chart. xv. 9 x 6, ff. circ. 200.

At end, in hand of text, + ὁ ἐν διακόνῳ θεοῦ ἐλά-
χιστος γεώργιος ὁ μωσχάμπρ.¹

¹ Fabricius Bibl. Graec. ed. 1809, xii. p. 46 gives an account of a Georgius Moschamper, apparently an ancestor of this scribe χαρταφύλαξ τῆς ἐκκλησίας in the 13th century.

+ ἀνάθεμα τῷ διαβάλλοντι ταύτην τὴν ὑπογραφήν καὶ εἰάν τις αὐτὴν ὡς νῦν φησὶν ὁ μωσχάμπρ ἐκακούρ-
γησεν.

Also: hic liber est mei Benedicti de Onctariis de Vincentie Secretarii Serenissimi dñi Regis Jerusalem Cipri et Armenie ct. M.cccclij.

84. (iii. C. 5) 'ARISTOPHANIS COMOEDIAE TRES: codex chart. in 4to. saec. xv.: missing.

85. (iii. C. 6) VARIA ASTRONOMICA: chart. xv. 9 x 6½, ff. 103, 22 ll., well written. At end: τέλος τῶ συντελεσθῆ τῶν καλῶν θεῷ χάρις θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον καὶ πόνος μιχαήλου σουλαρδου τοιγαροῦν ἐκ χώρας τῶν ἀργείων.

At beginning, Alberto Pio's name; at the end, Valla's.

87. (iii. C. 8) Scholia to SOPHOCLES, to THEOCRITUS, to PLATO'S EUTHYPHEO, METAPHRASIS OF PIND. OLYMP. alia: chart. xv. At beg. are the names of Valla (crossed out) and Alberto Pio.

88. (iii. C. 9) ARIST. MAGNA MORALIA, chart. xv. ff. 44, 9½ x 6½. At the end: γεώργιος ὁ βάλλα πλακεντίνας ἐξέγραψε ἐαυτῷ τε καὶ τοῖς φίλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰακώβῳ τῷ φερραρίῳ καὶ ματτῶ (?!). τῷ . . στω . . η: ἰακώβου εἴρη. are in an erasure.

At beg. Alberto Pio's name.

89. (iii. C. 10) PLATO, CRITIAS TIMEAEUS MENOS ἔροι: chart. xv. 9 x 6½: in Valla's hand, but not signed (unless a leaf has fallen out). At beg. Pio's name.

90. (iii. C. 11) MICHAEL PSELLUS, alii mathematici. Membr. xi. 9 x 6: small regular minuscule below the line. Deficient at beginning and end; many pages supplied by quite late hands on paper.

91. (iii. C. 12) ANON. παράφρασις εἰς τὴν σοφιστικὴν, MUSAEBUS, HERO and LEANDER: chart. xv. 9 x 6½, ff. 340. Much injured by damp: f. 69 is bound in strips of paper taken from the fly-leaves: on one, partly cut away, is γεωργίου τοῦ βάλλα ἐστὶ τὸ βιβλίον, crossed out—from which it may be inferred that the book belonged also to Pio.

92. (iii. C. 13) Scholia to EURIPID. HECUBA and PHOENISSAE: chart. xv. 8 x 6, ff. 66.

93. (iii. C. 14) Scholia to EUR. HEC. OREST. PHOEN.; ARIST. PLUT. NUB. RUB. NAB. ODYSSEY. a—s; A. B. V, Ω: alia.

Chart. xv. 9 x 6½, ff. circ. 200; at beginning Valla's and Pio's names, Valla's crossed out. The MS. bears in two places the figure 'No. 74,' from some earlier numeration.

95. (iii. C. 16) ACHILLES STATIUS ALII IN ARAT. PHAENOM.: chart. xvi. 8 x 6, ff. circ. 50.

96. (iii. C. 17) two books bound in one:

(1) CLAUD. PTOL. DE MUSICA: chart. xv. 8 x 5½, ff. circ. 50: many notes in Valla's hand.

(2) EUSTATH. IN DION. PERIEGET.: chart. xv. 9 x 6, ff. circ. 100.

97. (iii. C. 18) GALEN. ARS. MEDICA PARVA: chart. xv. 9 x 6½, ff. circ. 100, on a fly-leaf: Jacobii Ferdinandi Filii ex libris.

98. (iii. C. 19) HYMNAL. Membr. xi.—xii. 8½ x 6, ff. 144, quaternions signed back and front, 14 ll. Small upright minuscule below the line, no accents or breathings: notes above: wants two quaternions at beginning.

99. (iii. C. 20) PIND. OL. (part), HESIOD OP. DL., THEOCR., SOPH. AI. EL. OED. T., EUR. HEC. OREST.; all with scholia.

Chart. 8½ x 5½, ff. circ. 300: saec. xiv.—xv. mutilated at beginning. Notes in Valla's hand, who repaired the book.

100. (ii. D. 1) DEMETR. PHAL. DE ARTE ELOCUT., ARIST. DE ARTE POETICA, PLUTARCH V. ARTAXERX.: chart. xv. 11½ x 8, ff. circ. 75, quinions. Notes and some ff. of miscellaneous matter in Valla's hand: at

end of Poetics, γεωργίου βάλλα τὸ βιβλίον ἔστι τοῦτο. At beginning, table of contents in the hands of Pio's librarian, but without Alberto's name.

101. (ii. D. 2) JOSEPHI MONACHI PARAPHRASIS ARISTOTELIS DE ANIMA, DE VIRTUTE etc.: chart. xvi. $11\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$, ff. circ. 200: well written and preserved. On the back of the last page, in a different hand to that of the text, τέλος μουσουργοῦ α φ η (1508) οκτωβρ ζ: beneath are prayers, in the same hand.

102. (ii. D. 3) ACTS and EPISTLES, chart. $11\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$, ff. 188, signed quaternions, double columns, saec. xv. Copied from an xith century archetype. At beginning τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου ἀρχοντος Ἀλβέρτου πίου τὸ βιβλίον: at the end the fly-leaves, which may have contained Valla's name, are gone. A leaf at the end has a curious table of compendia with their meanings: ἔστω πρὸς διὰ &c. Cf. a MS. of the Biblioteca Angelica in Rome, No. 32.

103. (ii. D. 4) EUTOCIUS AND APOLLONIUS, GEOMETRICA: GEM. PLETHO, DE IIS QUIBUS ARISTOTELIS A PLATONE DIFFERT.

Chart. $11 \times 8\frac{1}{2}$, ff. 83: at beginning τοῦ λαμπροτάτου κράντορος Ἀλβέρτου πίου τὸ βιβλίον: on f. 83r Valla's signature.

104. (ii. D. 5) ILIAD, ABΓ, part of Δ, preceded by Isaac Porphyrogenitus' introduction: mut. at beg. and end; abundant scholia and grammatical and metrical notes.

Chart. xv. 11×8 , ff. 50, 39 ll. Of Valla and Pio, to whom the book is ascribed in 'Cenni Storici,' I found no trace.

107. (ii. D. 8) GALEN περὶ κρδέσεως τῶν ἀπλῶν φαρμάκων.

Chart. xv. 11×8 , ff. 212. At beginning τοῦ νουνεχεστάτου ἀρχοντος Ἀλβέρτου πίου κτήμα; at end Valla's signature.

108. (ii. D. 9) THEODORI GAZAE GRAMMATICA.

Chart. xv. $11 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$, ff. 136. At bottom of first page: ὁ παρούσα γραμματικὴ ἐναι ἐμοῦ βασιλείου Βάρελη.

109. (ii. D. 10) ALEX. APHROD. PROBLEMATIA, ARIST. PROBL., GALEN OP. MIN.: chart. xv. $11 \times 8\frac{1}{2}$, ff. circ. 100. Valla's signature on two places in the fly-leaves, once crossed out. Pio's name on the first; at the end of the text, ALBERTUS PS., followed by some further inscription in Latin.

110. (ii. D. 11) HOMER ODYSSEY, chart. xv. 11×8 , ff. 200: at beginning some verses in Valla's hand, and his signature; also at beginning τοῦ σοφωτάτου ἀρχοντος Ἀλβέρτου πίου τὸ βιβλίον.

111. (ii. D. 12) LOCI COMMUNES EX S. SCRIPTURA. Membr. x.—xi. 11×9 , ff. 199, quaternions, 25 ll.: free minuscule sloping to right, usually below the line, but often cut by it. On verso of last leaf but one is a Hymn with musical notes: on verso of last leaf is drawn a large eagle.

112. (ii. D. 13) APOLL. RHOD. ARGONAUTICA, with commentary.

Chart. xv. $11 \times 8\frac{1}{2}$, ff. circ. 200. Commentary is separate, and in a different hand to that of the text.

At beginning and end, Valla's signature, once crossed out: at beginning, in the hand of Pio's librarian, Ἀλβέρτου πίου καρπαίων ἀρχοντος κτήμα. Apollonii Argonautica cum commentariis manu doctissimi viri Alexandri chomatæ [?] cretensis episcopi arcadiensis orthodoxi et optimi. On Georgius Alexander v. Legrand, o.c. i. p. 8.

113. (ii. D. 14) NICOLAUS CABASILAS AL. ECCL. Chart. a. 1560, Nov. 14; $11 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$, ff. circ. 100: at end of Nicolaus, + ἐν ἔτει παρὰ ἀνδρῶν | νταμάρου τοῦ ἐπιδουρίτου | α φ η νοεμβρίου 15 + the rest of the MS. is in a different hand and unsigned. Another mode of

Darmarius' signature occurs in MS. No. 154. See Schmidt, Centralbl. f. Bibliothekswesen, III. 129 sq. The form Ντάρμαρος to which he takes exception (beruht vermuthlich auf falschen Lesung) is abundantly attested.

114. (ii. D. 15) ORPHEUS ARGONAUTICA, SOLON ELEGIES, PHOCYLIDES, PLATO EPINOMIS, chart. xv. 11×8 , ff. circ. 50. All in Valla's hand, with marginal notes and corrections. Signatures at end of Argonautica, γεωργίου δ οὐάλλα πλακεντίνος ἔγραψε; a hand, apparently Valla's own, has made οὐάλλα into βάλλας, and ἔγραψε into ἐξέγραψε. At beginning the usual inscription of Alberto Pio.

115. (ii. D. 16) THEOPHILUS PROTOSPATARIUS, al. medici. Chart. 11×8 , ff. 171, a. 1487, Nov. 25; in different hands. F. 166 v. at end of text: νικα^{ος} δ βλαστός κῆ νοευρίου α ν π ζ. At beginning Valla's and Pio's inscriptions. On Nic. Vlastus as a scribe cf. Legrand, Bibl. Hell. i. p. cxxviii.

116 and 117. (ii. D. 17 and 18) HERMOGENES, AL. RHET. Chart. xv. 11×8 , ff. circ. 100: voluminous scholia. The fly-leaves have perished.

118. (ii. D. 19) PORPHYR. ISAGOG., ARIST. ORGANON (part).

Chart. 11×8 , ff. 232, a. 1478, May 11. F. 228r:

ἐτελειώθη ἡ παρούσα βίβλος ἐν ἔτει ζ τ η [sic] ἐν μηνὶ μαΐου ια διὰ χειρὸς ἐμοῦ ἱέρους γεωργίου τοῦ γρηγοροπούλου + ελεηθὲ δ γράφας, συγχωρηθὲ δ ἔχων.

The third figure must have been omitted in the date, ζ τ η, since Georg. Gregoropoulos lived towards the end of the xvth century. On him v. Legrand, ii. p. 261 sq.

119. (ii. D. 20) PLUTARCHI OP. MIN. TRIA: membr. xvi. $11 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$, ff. circ. 50: illuminated.

120. (iii. D. 1) CHRYSOSTOM HOMILIES. Membr. xi. $11 \times 8\frac{1}{2}$, double columns, ff. circ. 200, quaternions, thirty-one written lines on fifteen ruled. Good upright minuscule, below the line.

121. (iii. D. 2) HESIOD OP. ET DI., THEOG. SCUT., followed by lives of Hesiod etc.: chart. xv. ff. 55, $10\frac{1}{2} \times 8$, all in Valla's hand. F. 55r. γεωργίου δ οὐάλλα (βάλλας) πλακεντίνος ἔγραψε. At beginning Alberto Pio's inscription.

123. (iii. D. 4) HOMER, ILIAD, chart. xv. $10\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$, ff. 450, quinions: the fly-leaves are wanting. F. 2r. is a note in Valla's hand.

125. (iii. D. 6) BESSARION, ἔλεγχος τῶν κατὰ πλάτωνος βλασφημιῶν. Membr. xvi. 10×7 , ff. 170.

126. (iii. D. 7) CLEMENT ALEX. etc. Membr. x. ff. 295, $10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$, 31 ll., quaternions. In three hands.

(a) Ff. 1—47, Clement Alex. προτρεπτικός πρὸς Ἕλληνας, 47—172 eiusd. παιδαγωγός, 172 v. 173r. a hymn, inc. σοὶ τόντε καὶ γὰρ παιδαγωγὲ προσφύω, 181—206r. eiusd. λόγος παρανητικός πρὸς Ἕλληνας, 206r.—227 Tatian, πρὸς Ἕλληνας, 227—238 v. Justin ἐκθεσις πίστews etc.

Thin upright minuscule, below the line but often running over it, strokes of one thickness, syllables of words much disjoined, quaternions not signed. F. 238 v. at bottom, in semiuncial: ζή ἀθηναγόρου πρεσβέαν π χριστιανῶν, ἐν τῇ β βυβλί του φέλλου. τοῦ ἐχομένου τετραβίου.

(b) 239r. one page of the conclusion of Tatian πρὸς Ἕλληνας, crossed out. 239 v.—288r. Athenagoras legat. pro Christianis, de resurrect. mort. The hand is of the same age as (a), but handsomer and more cursive, the stroke varies in thickness; quaternions are signed, beginning with λα. From this and the crossed out f. 239r. and the note on 238v. it is evident

that (b) is the original part of the book, and that (a) supplements the loss of the first λ quaternions.

(c) 288v.—293v. ἐκ τῶν φερμανοῦ λακταντίου τοῦ ῥωμαίου περὶ σιβύλλης καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν, defect. at end. This hand also is contemporary with the other two, but far freer and more abbreviated. *Scholía*, in two or more fine semiuncial hands, are frequent through the entire book, and were evidently added after the various parts had been put together.

For the position of this MS. in the text of Clement v. Dindorf, ed. Oxon. 1869, praef. vii.

127. (iii. D. 8) ARISTOPHANES PLUTUS (ff. 8—42), CLOUDS (44—84), FROGS (84—130), KNIGHTS (131—163), BIRDS (163—224).

Chart. xiv. 10 × 6½, ff. 224, 17 ll., quaternions: interlinear glosses and marg. scholia to all five plays.

On a fly-leaf which has been pasted in at beginning are:

- (1) De miser Marco musuro.
- (2) Questo libri é de mi andronico Manolesso.
- (3) Alvise barbaro.

On f. 1 at bottom, *Iste aristophanes sunt [sic] Fr. (f) francisci barbari veneti patritii*. The same two names, Alvise and Francesco Barbaro, appear in the MS. Vat. gr. 1421 saec. xv. See M. de Nohac, *Fulvio Orsini*, p. 167n.

128. (iii. D. 9) THEOPHYLACT ON MATTHEW. Membr. xii. 9 × 6½, ff. 88, 43 ll., quaternions, of which 9 is missing and 8 misplaced.

129. (iii. D. 10) XENOPHON SYMP., OEC., PLATO PARMENIDES.

Chart. xv. 9 × 6½, ff. circ. 70. Five leaves of the Parmen., the title and some notes are in Valla's hand: the fly-leaves are missing.

130. (iii. D. 11) ISOCRATES ORATT. that *ad Demonicum* is lost (one quaternion). Membr. xv. 9½ × 6½, ff. circ. 100. Has the inscriptions of Valla and Pio, and many notes in Valla's hand.

131. (iii. D. 12) THEOGNIS. Chart. 9 × 6½, ff. 46, a. 1492.

At end: *χειρ μικρή ἀργείου σουλιάρδου: πνςβ*. Has Valla's and Pio's inscriptions.

132. (iii. D. 13) VARIA ASTROLOGICA: chart. xv. 8½ × 6, ff. circ. 100. In 'Cenni Storici' said to have belonged to Valla and Pio: I did not find their names.

133. (iii. D. 14) ARISTOPHANES FROGS (1—48), KNIGHTS (49—96), BIRDS (97—168), ACHAERNIANS (169—216): interlinear glosses but no scholia. chart. xv. 9 × 6½, ff. 216. Fly-leaves gone.

135. (ii. E. 2) ARISTOT. PROBLEM., ALEX. APHR. PROBLEM., *anonymi dialogus*, inc. *οὐδὲν ἀρετῆς δυνατότερον οὐδὲν τυραννικώτερον*.

Chart. xv. 11½ × 8, ff. 114: the last two pieces written by Antonius Damilas—*ἀντώνιος δαμίλας καὶ τοῦτο ἐν κρήτῃ ἐξέγραψεν*. At beginning and end Valla's inscription, at beginning Alberto's.

136. (ii. E. 3) THEODORUS PRODROMUS al. eccl. Headings of part of the MS. are in the hand of Andreas Darmarius. Chart. xvi. 11½ × 8, ff. circ. 70.

138. (ii. E. 5) S. IOANN. DAMASCENUS HIST. BART. ET IOSAPHAT. Chart. 11 × 8, ff. circ. 100 a. 1560, Dec. 8. Headings and more than half of text in hand of A. Darmarius. *Subscription: ἐν ἔτει παρὰ ἀνδρῶν | νταμάρου τοῦ ἐπισταυρίστου | ἀφ' ἐν βενετία μὴ δεκεβρίω ᾗ*.

140. (ii. E. 7) APOLLON. RHOD. ARGONAUTICA: chart. xv. 11 × 8, ff. 112, illuminated: has the original vellum wrapping. F. 2r. Valla's inscription, f. 2 v. that of Alberto: *τοῦ φιλανθρωποτάτου ἀρχοντος κ.τ.λ.*

141. (ii. E. 8) IOANN. ACTUARIUS DE PRAEVIDENTIA EX URINIS etc.

Chart. xv. 11½ × 8, ff. 111: at beginning on vellum cover the inscriptions of Valla and Pio.

143. (ii. E. 10) TRIODIUM: chart. 11½ × 8, ff. 192, double columns, a. 1439; *subscription: ἐτελειω τὸ παρὸν τριώδιον ἐν ἔτει ς τ μς ινδ β μηνί ια θ ἐν τῇ βενετία*.

Beneath, two lines of cipher: + ζτθβὲν κθβζκχζτβ ζλτσλχψλ'χελχγθ'οσνλω+ i.e. *γραφὴν παρ' ἐμοῦ γρηγορίου τοῦ μουζιάλωνος*.

At beginning: *μουσούρου καὶ τῶν χρωμένων*.

144. (ii. E. 11) Miscell., among which ARIST. DE MUNDO, ISOCHR. AD DEMON., ARIST. DE VIRTUTIBUS LUCIAN DE NON TEM. CRED., DE LUCTU, CIC. SOMN. SCIP. and CAT. MAI. graece.

Chart. 11 × 7½, ff. 177, 41 ll. a. 1441.

At end of Ar. de mundo: + ἐπληρώθη ὁ παρὸν λόγος διὰ χειρὸς ἐμοῦ νοταρίου τῆς ἀγιωτάτης μητροπόλεως λακεδαιμονίας.....νικολάου τοῦ λεβενίτη μηνί ιουλλίῳ ινδβ' ἐτους ς τ μ θ ὁ αὐτὸς λόγος ἐστὶν κυρίου δημητρίου καὶ αὐθέντου μου βαούλλ τοῦ καβάκη: + χωρικός δὲ ἐστὶν εἰς τὸ γράφειν καὶ διὰ τὸν κύριον εἵχεσθαι καὶ μὴ κατάρσασθαι. Ff. 175, 176 are two letters to Cabaces: the first inc. τῷ αὐθέντῃ μου τῷ ἀδελφῷ μου κυρίῳ δημητρίῳ βαούλ τῷ καβάκη. Αὐθέντῃ μου ἀδελφῷ μου τοῦ θεοῦ δέομαι θγαίνειν κ.τ.λ., signed γεώργιος σχολάριος. The second inc. τῷ εὐδοκστάτῃ καὶ εὐμενεστάτῃ ἀρχοντὶ ἡμετέρῳ αὐθέντῳ δημητρίῳ βαούλ καβάκη. εἰς μένος ἐκπεπλήρωκα σου τοῦ πταγμα κ.τ.λ., signed ὁ σὸς κατὰ πάντα ματθαῖος καμαριώτης.

F. 177 v. another letter to Cabaces: correspondent's name above, γαβριήλ ιερομόναχος.

F. 175 v. at top: τοῦ ἀγκονιτάου κυριακοῦ οἰκῆ χειρεὶ ἀμφώταρα [sic]: below, in a large hand, *ἔστι οὐδὲς εἰς ἀγνωστον φέρεται*.

At beginning: Libro di (?) arie Coie (?)—Grec^o Man^{to}.

Nicolas Lebenites is doubtless the same as Nicolas Vestiarites, No. 42 in M. Omont's 'Fac-similés.'¹ On Demetrius Cabaces v. de Nohac, *Fulv. Ors.* pp. 148, 147 and 448. This MS. may add something to our knowledge of him.

145. (ii. E. 13) PLUTARCH, XENOPH. SCRIPT. MIN., ALEX. APHR. PHYSICA etc.

Chart. xv. 11 × 8, ff. circ. 100, in two hands. At end Valla's signature, at beginning Pio's, with table.

146. (ii. E. 14) THEOCRITUS. Chart. xv. 11½ × 8, ff. 49. *Subscription: γεώργιος ὁ βάλλας πλακέντινος ἔγραψε*; notes in Valla's hand. At beginning Alberto Pio's inscription.

147. (ii. E. 14) THEODORUS METOCHITA. Chart. xvi. 11½ × 8, ff. circ. 70. Index and titles in hand of A. Darmarius. In the middle of the book the initials etc. have not been added.

149. (ii. E. 16) PORPHYR. ON PTOL., MARINUS ON EUCL., AR. ANAL. POSTER.

Chart. xv. 11 × 8, ff. circ. 200.

At beginning τοῦ θεωρητικωτάτου ἀρχοντος ἀλβέρτου πίου κτῆμα.

At end γεώργιου τοῦ βάλλα ἐστὶ τὸ βιβλίον.

152. (ii. E. 19) DIO CHRYSOST. DE REGNO, DE TYRANNIDE, VENATOR, DE VIRTUT., PLUT. DE MUS., PORPH. IN PTOL. HARMON.

Chart. xv. 11 × 7½, ff. circ. 100. Notes in Valla's hand: at beginning of text in scribe's hand, γεώργιου τοῦ βάλλα ἀνδρὸς εὐγενοῦς καὶ σοφοῦ τὸ βιβλίον: this

¹ To the MS. written by him we may now add Vat. Palat. 256, a. 1449, from Sig. Stevenson's Catalogue.

crossed out by Pio's librarian, who has above 'Αλβερου πλον καρπαίων άρχοντος κτήμα. On a fly-leaf Valla's own signature.

154. (iii. E. 1) ANASTASIUS alii theolog. Chart. xvi. 12 × 8, ff. circ. 200. Greater part of text and all headings by Darmarius: f. 59 v. διὰ χειρὸς ἀνδρῶν νταριαρου τοῦ ἐκ μονεμβασίας ἤτις καλεῖται ἐπίδουρος ἐτελειώθη τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον.

155. (iii. E. 2) ANASTASIUS, NEOPHYTUS al. chart. 12 × 8, ff. circ. 400 a. 1550. *Subscription* α φ ν ἀπριλλῃ ᾧ ἐπληρώθη τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον τὸ ἐπονομαζόμενον εἰς τὸ δόγμα τῶν ἀσμάτων τοῦ σοφοῦ σολομώντος διὰ χειρὸς καμοῦ γεωργ. τρυφῶν καὶ οἱ ἀναγιγνώσκοντες αὐτὸ εὖχεσθαι μοι διὰ τὸν κν.

156. (iii. E. 3) IOANNES BECCUS EPIGRAPHAE, al. theol. Chart. 12 × 8, a. 1560. Beccus written and signed by A. Darmarius, Sept. 20, 1560: the rest in another hand.

157. (iii. E. 4) CHRYSOST. HOM. IN MATTH. chart. 12 × 8, ff. circ. 300: written by Darmarius, but apparently unsigned.

158. (iii. E. 5) MICHAEL GLYCAS. EPP. chart. 11 × 8, ff. circ. 300, circ. 1560, *subscription* 6 ff. from end: αὕτη ἐγεγράφη ἡ παρούσα βιβλος, ἀπὸ χειρὸς ἀνδρῶν νταριάρου τοῦ ἐκ μονεμβασίας καὶ οἱ οὐκ ἔχει ἀληθὲς μέρος εὖχεσθαι ὅτι ὁ γράφων παραγράφει.

159. (iii. E. 6) PHILIPPUS SOLITARIUS. Chart. 12 × 8, a. 1560, Sept. 15, written and signed by A. Darmarius.

163. (iii. E. 10) GREG. NAZ. al. Chart. xv. 11½ × 8, ff. circ. 300.

At beginning: *hunc liber ego fr franciscus grecus peccator emi in insula rhodi et valet annos 9*.....

164. (iii. E. 11) ORPHEUS HYMNS (1-27), CALIMACHUS HYMNS (28-58), HOMER HYMNS (49-84).

Chart. xv. 11½ × 8, ff. 92: all in Valla's hand, with marginalia by him: f. 84 v. γεωργίος δ' οὐαλλα (βάλλας) πλακεντίνο ἔγραψε f. 10 v. inscription of Alberto Pio. This MS. is E of the Homeric Hymns: v. under no. 57.

165. (iii. E. 12) GRAMM. VAR. BYZANT. Chart. xv. ff. 240, 11½ × 8. At end, Valla's signature: the front fly-leaves have gone. The writer of 'Cenni Storici' thinks the scribe was Antonius Damilas.

166. (ii. F. 1) GREGOR. NAZIANZEN. ORATT. Membr. xv. 12 × 8½, ff. circ. 70, illuminated. On rect. of fly-leaf: *ex thessalonica constantinopolim et inde venetias hic liber adiectus a. 1486 dno Georgio Valla*; beneath, in an older hand: *georgius Xgonus Cretensis e rhythyma*. On the verso, the usual inscription of Pio. Fly-leaves at the end are gone.

167. (ii. F. 2) CYRILLUS περὶ ζώων ιδιότητος: chart. xv. 12 × 8, ff. circ. 50.

171. (ii. F. 6) THEODORETUS al. theol. Chart. 12 × 8, ff. circ. 450: first 288 pages in an unsigned hand, the rest written by A. Darmarius, September 29, 1560, at Venice, according to the subscription.

173. (ii. F. 8) EMAN. BRYENNIIUS DE MUS., ARISTIDES DE MUS., BACCHIUS ISAGOGUE ARTIS MUS., HEROD. DE HOM. VITA, JULIANI IMP. SYMPOSIUM. Chart. xv. 11½ × 8½, ff. 140, in various hands. Contains, at beginning and end, the inscriptions of Valla and Pio.

174. (ii. F. 9) PTOL. ALMAGEST. AND FRUCTUS LIBR. SUORUM, PETOSIRIS EP.: AD NECHEPSEM. Chart. 11½ × 8½, ff. 264, a. 1488. The whole in Valla's hand. At end of Ptol. γεωργίος δ' βάλλας πλακεντίνο ἔξεγραψε ἐν ἐνετίαις ἔτι ἀπὸ θεογονίας εὐ πῇ ποιανεισιάνος δεκατῇ (εν ερας.) ἰσταμίου, at beginning table in hand of Pio's librarian, but his

name is missing. I have not found another example of a dated MS. in Valla's hand.¹

176. (ii. F. 11) EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS IN PSALMOS.

Chart. 11½ × 8, double columns, ff. 239, a. 1464.

At end: ἔξας χίλε πέφυκε τῶν λυκαβάντων δις ὁ τετρακὸς καὶ τῆς ἑκατοντάδος ἰβδομήκοντα καὶ δύο οὐχὶ πλεόν δεκάτης καὶ δευτέρης ἰνδικτιῶνης εἰκοστὸς καὶ ὄγδοος ἡλίον κύκλος ἀντωνίῳ τλήμονι καὶ τρισαθλίῳ

A strict interpretation of δις ὁ τετρακὸς would, I suppose, give 6872, i.e. 1364 as the date; but the indiction and Solar Cycle seem to make 1464 certain.

177. (ii. F. 12) ZONARAS EPT. HISTORIARUM. Chart. xiv. 11½ × 8, ff. 564, well written. Front fly-leaves are gone: f. 3 v. ἀρεσίνιον πατριαρχον.....: f. 560r. Valla's signature: f. 563 v. Pio's inscription. Above the latter is an erased inscription in Latin: *iste liber est mei*———. It may be doubted if the Arsenius to whom this book belonged was Apostolius, made Archbishop of Monembasia in 1514 (Legrand, i. p. clviii.)

178. (ii. F. 13) Chart. xiv. 11½ × 8½, ff. 242: at the end is an Easter Table, in which as an example is taken the year *ςωμδ*, i.e. 1336. f. 69r. are some moncondylia, which appear to read *ἀγία τριάς βοηθεῖ τῷ εὐτελοῦς ἱερῷ μανουῆλ τῷ μαργῶνου*: v. Legrand ii. p. xxiii. *sqq.*

179. (iii. F. 1) Chart. xvi. 13 × 9, ff. circ. 100: written entirely by A. Darmarius, but unsigned.

181. (iii. F. 3) LIBANIUS EPP. Chart. xvi. 12½ × 9, ff. 200.

The writer of 'Cenni Storici' considers that this MS. was copied from a good archetype.

183. (iii. F. 5) CHRYSOST. HOMIL. ON MATTH. Membr. xi. 12 × 9, ff. circ. 300, double columns, 32ll. quaternions.

185. (ii. F. 6) DIOD. SICUL. Chart. xv. 12 × 8, ff. 216, all in one hand. At end: *μχαῆλος ἀποστόλῃς βυζάντιος μετὰ τὴν ἄλωσην τῆς αὐτοῦ πατρίδος πενία συζῶν, καὶ τήνδε τὴν βιβλον μισθῶ ἐν κρήτῃ ἐξεγράψεν*. The MS. has the original vellum covers; on the recto of the fly-leaf, *μουσοῦρου κτίεα ἦν εὖτε τὰδ ἐγράφετο*.

187. (iii. F. 8) IOANN. CHRYSOST. EPP. Chart. xvi. 12 × 8, ff. circ. 100. Unsigned, but perhaps written by A. Darmarius.

188. (iii. F. 10) IOANN. XIPHILINUS. SERMONES. Chart. 12 × 8, ff. 560, saec. xvi? at end: *ἐτελειώθη ἡ παρούσα δέλτος δῶρον τιμῶν θεοῦ διὰ χειρὸς καμοῦ ἰωάννου πιζάνου εὐτελοῦς τε καὶ ἀμαθοῦς, καὶ οἱ ἀναγιγνώσκοντες εὖχεσθῆ μοι διὰ τὸν κύριον*. This scribe is unidentified.

190. (iii. F. 12) DIONYSIUS AREOPAG. al. eccl. Chart. 12 × 7½, ff. circ. 450. From the tables of festivals, it would appear that the MS. was written about the year *ςωαβ*, i.e. 1324. In the binding are two leaves of a late uncial ecclesiastical MS. in double columns, said in the Catal. to be the 'Encomium of Chrysippus Presbyterus.

¹ Perhaps the archetype of the MS. in the Escorial α 1, 1, Miller *Catalogue*, p. 453, of which the subscription runs: *Δωνάτος ὁ Βοντούρελλος ἐξεγράψεν ἀπὸ ἀντιγράφου ὃ πρὶν μὲν κτήμα ὑπάρχον τοῦ γεωργίου τοῦ βάλλας (καὶ γὰρ ὁ αὐτὸς ἐγεγράφει τῇ ἰδίᾳ χειρὶ) ὕστερον τοῦ ἐπιφανεστάτου ἀρχοντος ἀλβέρτου πίου τοῦ καρπαίου: ἐγένετο ἔτι ἀπὸ θεογονίας ἀφῃς σκιρφοριάνος ἰβδόμη μεσοῦντος, ἐν Κάρπῳ, τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀλβέρτου ἐκβαλθέντος ἡδὲ τῆς ἰδίας ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ σκυρπίου τοῦ μαρωτάτου τῶν ζώων.*

191. (iii. F. 13) EURIP. HIPPOCR. HERACLIT. DIOG. CRATET. AESCHIN. EPP., AEL. VAR. HIST. Chart. xv. 11½ × 8, ff. circ. 50, in two hands. At beginning, Alberto's inscription with table: Valla's name does not appear, but the outer front fly-leaf and all those at the end have gone.

193. (iii. F. 15) LUCIAN: for a list of contents and a collation, see Sommerbrodt, Rhein. Mus. 1882.

Membr. 11½ × 9, 33 ll., quaternions ff. 112: well-written minuscule below the line, of xith century character, but abounding in xith century forms and ligatures: hence Sommerbrodt is probably right in dating the MS. at xi.—xii. as against Montfaucon (Diar. Ital. p. 33) who thought it was of the xth.¹ Text and scholia are both freely abbreviated.

196. (ii. G. 3) ACT. APOSTL. and EPISTLES to end of that to the Hebrews. Membr. ix.—x. 12 × 9, ff. 268, quaternions signed on first page, rulings on hair side.

Ff. 1—43 *Acts of the Apostles*, wanting quaternion A: slanting thin uncial, upon the line, thirty lines on the page; at f. 40r. (quaternion Z) begins and continues for 3 ff. a semiuncial hand that has previously written the titles.

Ff. 44—268 *Epistles*: well-formed minuscule, above the line, 32 ll. There are stichometric notes. Several ff. are supplied on paper.

197. (ii. G. 3) EUSTRATIUS, ASPASIVS, MICHAEL EPH., ANON. IN ARIST. ETHICA. Chart. xv.—xvi. 13 × 9, ff. ? 600.

At the end, in a hand not that of Pio's usual librarian: τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον πέρας εἴληφε προστάγματι καὶ δαπάνῃ τοῦ ἐκφανεστάτου καὶ λογιωτάτου κόμιστος Ἀλβέρτου πλίου τοῦ καρφαίων ἄρχοντος: καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς: the same formula recurs in No. 205.

I conjecture that it is a statement inserted by way of receipt by an agent or representative of Pio's, in one or two of a series of books ordered of contemporary writers—in distinction to those he obtained from Valla's library; and that to τὰ ἐξῆς should be supplied βιβλία. A date and place might be given by No. 207. To seek to identify these MSS. without further evidence would be rash, but it is a possible conjecture that they may be found among those that follow MS. 197 and 205, are of the size 13 × 9, and contain for the most part Commentators on Aristotle.

198. (ii. G. 5) ALEX. APHR. IN ARIST. METEOR., alii astronom. Chart. xv.—xvi. 13 × 9, ff. circ. 100. At beginning a table in the hand of Pio's usual librarian.

203. (ii. G. 10) PSALTER. Membr. xi. 12½ × 9, 20 ll., quaternions not numbered. Very large minuscule below the line.

At beginning: ἐνέθη ἡ βίβλος αὐτὴ ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ μονῇ ὑπὲρ ἀφίσσεως τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν μοναχοῦ θεοδοσίου τοῦ ξυλαλά: καὶ ὁ ἀναγιγνώσκων ταύτην διὰ τὸν κύριον ἴσως μακαρίσῃ αὐτὸν καὶ ἵσως δέεται ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ. Given in Montfaucon, Diar. Ital. p. 31, Palaeogr. Gr. p. 56.

205. (iii. G. 1) IOANN. PHILOP. IN ARIST. ANALYT., LEO MAG. IN ARIST. AN. PRIOR. Chart. xvi. 13 × 9, ff. circ. 300; the same subscription as No. 197.

207. (iii. G. 3) ALEX. APHR. IN AR. DE SENSU, PROCLUS ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΩΣΙΣ ΦΥΣΙΚῆς, al. Chart. 13 × 9, ff. circ. 300, a. 1522.

At end of Alex. Aphr.: ἔγραφε ὁ ἀμβρόσιος ὁ λέων ὁ νικηθεὶς ὁ τοῦ μαρίνου υἱὸς ἐνετίρησι γαμηλιῶνος ἱσταμένου γ' α φ κ β.

¹ Prof. Vitelli's doubts (Museo Italiano, vol. i. p. 18 note) are not in this instance justified.

At end of Proclus: καὶ ταῦτα γέγραπται ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀμβροσίου. The rest of the MS. is in a different hand and not signed.

215. (iii. G. 11) CLEOMEDES ΠΥΚΛΙΚῆς θεωρία, IOANN. PEDASIMUS DE COMETIS ET PLANETIS.

Chart. xv. 13 × 9½, ff. 52, scholia. At the end there are notes in Valla's hand, but the end fly-leaves, which may have contained his name, are gone. At beginning Alberto Pio's usual inscription.

216. (ii. H. 1) EPHRAEM SYR. al. theol. et med. Chart. xvi. 13 × 9, ff. circ. 500: in various hands, one of which is that of A. Darmarius.

217—219. (ii. H. 2—4) GALEN, OPERA VARIA MIN. All of them are chart. xvi. 13 × 0.

221. (ii. H. 6) HERODOTUS. Chart. xv.—xvi. ff. 184, 13 × 9.

224. 225. (ii. H. 9, 10) IOANN. CANTACUZENUS, HIST. BYZANT.

Chart. xvi. 13½ × 9½, ff. 640, a. 1555.

At end of second volume:

τέλος εἴληφε τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον διὰ χειρὸς ἐμοῦ ἰωάννου μαυρομάτου τοῦ ἐκ κερκυρῶν κατὰ μήνα μῖαιον ζο λ [sic] τοῦ αφρὲ: ἔτους τῆς κατὰ σάρκα γεννήσεως τοῦ κν καὶ θν καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν ιϥ χν.

At the beginning of both volumes, *Francisci Bologniti*.

226. (ii. H. 11) GALEN. OPUSC. Chart. xvi. 13 × 9, ff. 380. ? written by Ambrosius Leo of Nola, (No. 207).

228. (ii. B. 13) THEODORUS METOCHITA.

Chart. 13 × 9, ff. 230, a. 1560, March 16. At end:

Ἐνετίρησιν παρὰ μιχαήλου μαλέα: τοῦ ἐπιδανυρίου ὠφέ μαρίνου ιϥ

229. (iii. H. 1) GREG. NAZ. and BASIL. EPP. Bomb. 18½ × 10½, ff. 287, 35 ll., quaternions, aec. xi. defect. at both ends. Large free minuscule below the line, often abbreviated.

230. (iii. H. 2) CHRYSOST. HOM. IN GENERIM. Membr. 14 × 10½, double columns, 34 ll., ff. 264, quaternions numbered back and front; illuminated. Regular ecclesiastical minuscule below the line, a. 1050.

F. 264v. in semiuncial: ἐγράφη ἡ ἱερὰ βίβλος ταύτη εὐδοκίᾳ μὲν τῆς ἁγίας ὁμοουσίου | καὶ ζωοποιοῦ τριάδος συνεργίᾳ δὲ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ τρισμάκα | ρίων πρὶν ἡμῶν, νικολάου καὶ συμέων, προτροπῇ νικο | λάου τοῦ εὐλαβεστάτου μοναχοῦ πρεσβυτέρου καὶ κα | θηγουμένου ταύτης σεβασμίας μονῆς: χειρὶ ἰωάν | νου ταπεινοῦ μοναχοῦ καὶ ἐλαχίστου πρεσβυτέρου ἔτε | λιῶθι δὲ μνη | νοεμβρίου κη ινδ δ, ἔτους ς ς ν θ | βασιλεῦδοντος κωνσταντίνου τοῦ ἐπικλήν μονομα | χου καὶ ἱεραρχούντος μη | [αθλ].

Two lines below, in minuscule: ὅσοι τῇ ποικιλῇ ἐντυγχάνετε ταύτη καὶ τοῦ χρυσωγούς ἐντροφάτε τοῖς λόγους οὗς ἐκ πνς συνέταξεν ἁγίως ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν βιβλίων τοῦ μωυσέως, μωλεῖν ποιέσθαι τῇ ἐμῇ οὐθενίας ὅπως τόχομι ὡς ὁμόνυμον τοῦτον, οὗτον καὶ πρέσβην πρὸς χρυστὸν καὶ προστάτην.

F. 64r. at top, in an ignorant hand: ηγκωλας ἀναγνωστῆς πρωεταξ ἀπστ..... (the rest is cut off by the binder)

F. 255r. in a good contemporary hand; † καὶ μεγάλῃ δευτέρᾳ με σώζοιτο † χεῖ μου σώσον τον τὰ νικηθεῖς † sim. ff. 263v. 264r.

F. 264v. below the other subscriptions:

μνη ἱανναρίου κς ινδ [sic] ἔτους ς ω λ δ [1326] ἐκκημη ὁ δουλ' τοῦ θθ | νικόδιμος μοναχὸς ὁ κονομαχὴς ἡ ἐκονομασθεὶς γεκίδιμος [sic]. ib. at bottom: in τὰς γεωργίῳ τοῦ βάλλα ἐστι τοῦτο βιβλίον. There are occasional marginal notes in his hand. Pio's name

does not occur, but the fly-leaves at either end are gone.

231. (iii. H. 3) PHOTIUS, BIBLIOTHECA. Chart. 14 × 9½, ff. 720, 36 ll., quinions, a. 1559. At end, in red: ἡ βιβλος αὕτη ἐμὸν κορηλίον τοῦ ναυπλίου τῶν μουμουρέων | υἱοῦ ἀνδρέου, μετὰ τὴν τῆς πρὸς ὑπὸ τούρκων ἄλωσης ἐνετίσει | διατρίβοντος

ἐξεγράφη ἐκεῖ ἀπὸ τῆς θεογονίας α.φ.υ.θ.

232. (iii. H. 4) inc. πίναξ σὺν θεῷ ἁγίῳ πάντων τῶν βιβλίων τῆς βιβλιοθήκης τῆς ἀποστολικῆς, τῆς ἀ τραπεζῆς: ἡ τάξις τῶν βιβλίων. The titles are separated by red lines drawn across the page. Inc. Διδύμου σχόλια εἰς τὴν ὁμήρου ἡλιάδα ὁμήρου ἡλιάς μετὰ τῆς ἐξηγήσεως.

expl. μεταφραστῆς περιέχον βίους διαφόρων ἁγίων. Chart. xvi. 12½ × 9, ff. 86.

233. (iii. H. 5) HIPPOCR. OP. MIN. Chart. xvi. 13½ × 9½, ff. circ. 200, on fly-leaf, six times repeated; νικολαὸς ὁ βονακιόλλος.

236. (iii. F. 18) SEXTUS EMPIR. ADV. MATH., LIBAN. ORATT., var. eccl. Chart. xvi. 11½ × 8, ff. circ. 200. In various hands, one of which, though unsigned, is that of Darmarius.

240. (iii. F. 17) VARIA THEOL. ET MED. Chart. xvi. of various sizes and in different hands: part is by Darmarius, whose signature is on f. 45r; χεῖρ ἀνδρέου νταρμάρου τοῦ ἐκ μονεμβασίας: he has added the headings elsewhere. At the end are bound up pp. 65—80 of an edition of Demosthenes on vellum; viz. πρὸς Δικρίτην (end), ὑπὲρ Φορμίωνος, πρὸς Πανταίνετον (beginning).

242. (iii. B. 16) EVANGELISTARIUM AND SYNAXARIUM.

Bomb. 7½ × 5½, xiii.—xiv. 19 ll. quaternions, well written. At end of Evang. on a blank page, in either the same or a contemporary hand, θεῶδ' / μοναχὸς δ' ἀντιγονίτης.

243. (iii. B. 17) ACTS AND EPISTLES. Membr. xi. 7 × 5, ff. 296, quaternions, illuminated, defect at end. Upright minuscule, below the line.

245. (iii. G. 12) NICOMACHUS GERAS. ARITHMETICA.

Chart. xv. 13 × 9, ff. circ. 100; on a piece of paper pasted on a fly-leaf: δοκίμιον τοῦ κοῦδίου καὶ τοῦ μελανίου καὶ τοῦ χερσίου μου καὶ τοῦ χαρτίου μου.

247. (iii. D. 20) ATHENAGORAS, TATIAN. al. theol.

Chart. xv. 9 × 7, ff. 111.

On fly-leaf at beginning: Hoc i florentie exscribit fecit Jo. Fe. Nes. M-rad (f) & J (f).

At bottom, in a late hand: di S. spirito di reggio. On Giovanni Francesco Pico see the article in Tiraboschi Bibl. Modenese.

249. (ii. C. 13) contains, (a) CHRYSOST. HOM. chart. xv.—xvi. ff. circ. 350; (b) PLATO GORGIAS (ff. 1—28), PHAEDO (28—51), HALCYON, part, (51, 52), with scholia. Chart. xiv.—xv. ff. 52, 11½ × 9, (c) ANON. COMMENT. inc. ἰστέον ὅτι ὁ διάλογος περιέχει διαλεγόμενα πρόσωπα (ff. 80), defect. at end, (d) Βοετίου φιλοσόφου περὶ τέχνης διαλεκτικῆς (ff. 25).

250. (iii. C. 21) PINDAR OLYMP. Membr. 8 × 4½, ff. 133, a. 1485. At end in red: μετεγράφη ὁ παρὼν πίνδαρος ἀναλώμασι τοῦ τιμίου ἀνδρὸς κυρίου λαυρεντίου λαυρεντάνου [both in ras.] διὰ χειρὸς ἐμοῦ ἰωάννου πρεσβυτέρου βόσσω τοῦ κρητός, χιλιοστῶ τετρακοστῶ ὀδοκωστῶ πεμπτῶ μηνὸς δεκεβρίου πεμπτῆ.¹

¹ Was Lorenzo Loredano the son of the Doge Leonardo, who (Valentinelli I. p. 40) was procurator S. Marci de supra in 1529? He possessed two MSS. now in the D'Orville collection at the Bodleian, x. 1, 1, 2, Etym. Magn. s. xiv. and x. 1, 1, 3, Pollux

252. (ii. *33) GUARINI EROTEMATA, in Greek and Latin, parallel columns. Chart. 8½ × 6½, ff. circ. 230, a. 1525. At end, on opposite pages: finis libro ferrariae anno MDXXV Die 26 julii, τέλος τῶ βιβλίου ἐπὶ τῆς φερρarias ἐκεῖ α φ κ ε ἡμερὰ κ ε ιουλίου.

INDEX.

DATED MANUSCRIPTS.

- 1050, No. 230.
1324, circ. No. 190.
1336, circ. No. 178.
1393, No. 62.
1439, No. 143.
1441, No. 144.
1449, No. 58.
1455, No. 44.
1464, No. 176.
1469, No. 17.
(1484), No. 10.
1485, No. 250.
1487, No. 115.
1488, No. 174.
1492, No. 131.
1498, No. 118.
1517, No. 19.
1519, No. 19.
1522, No. 207.
1525, No. 252.
1541, No. 33.
1550, No. 155.
1555, No. 225.
1559, No. 231.
1560, Nos. 114, 138, 156, 159, 171, 228.

SCRIBES.

[G.] Alexander Bp. of Arcadia in Crete, 112.

Ambrosius Leo Marini f. 267, (226).

Andreas Darmarius (Ντάρμαρος) 113, 136, 138, 147, 154, 156, 157, 158, 159, 171, 179, (187), 216, 236, 240.

Antonius (a. 1464) 176.

Antonius Damilas, 135.

Cornelius Murnureus, 231.

David Bp. of Armenians in Cyprus (Armenian), 19.

Georgius, 71.

Georgius Gregoropoulos, 118.

Georgius ὁ μωσχάμπρ, 82.

Georgius ὁ μονάμων, 143.

Georgius Tryphon, 155.

Georgius Valla, 21, 75, 88, 86, 121, 146, 164, 174, (a. 1488).

Ioannes, 230.

Ioannes Mauromatus, 225.

Ioannes πίνδος, 188.

Ioannes Rhosus, 250.

Laelius Garussus (Latin), 19.

Matthaeus Camariotes, 10.

Matthaeus Sebastus Lampudes, 11.

Michael Apostolis, 185.

Michael Maleas, 228.

Michael Suliardus (76), 85, 131.

Nicolaus ὁ λεβενίτης, 144.

s. xv. and a third MS. of the Greek anthology 'papyraceus saec. xiv. in quadrata forma grandiori,' not now at the Bodleian, but of which D'Orville has a collation in his copy of the Anthology, Steph. 15—66 (cf. the D'Orville Catalogue, p. 64.)

Nicolaus Varelis, 33.
 Nicolaus Vlastus, 115.
 Theodorus, 17.

OWNERS, ETC.

[Apostolius], Arsenius, 177.
 Barbaro, Alvise, 127.
 Barbaro, Francesco, 127.
 Βορᾶσιος, Nicolaus δ, 233.
 Cabaces, Demetrius Rhaoul, 144.
 Calosynas, Antonius, 62.
 Chrysogonus, Georgius, 166.
 Cyriac of Ancona, 144.
 Euphemia, 28.
 Franciscus of Bologna, 224, 225.
 Franciscus grecus, 163.
 Gabriel monachus, 144.
 Georgius Scholarius, 144.
 Jacobus of Ferrara (?), 88.
 Jacobus Ferdinandi f., 97.
 Loredano, Lorenzo, 250.
 Manolesso, Andronicus, 127.
 Margounius, Manuel, 178.
 μεγαλάννης, Zacharias δ, 60.

Musurus, Marcus 101, 127, 143, 185.
 Nicolaus cathegum, 230.
 Onctarius (de), Benedictus of Vicenza, 82.
 Panidiotes Demetrius, 28.
 Panormita Antonio, 70.
 Pico, Giovanfrancesco, della Mirandola, 247.
 Pio, Alberto, (10), 21, (26), 28, 37, 38, 39, 40, 51, 54, 55, (56), 57, 59, 61, 70, 75, 76, (77), 85, 87, 88, 89, (91), 93, 100, 102, 103, (104), 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 115, (129), 130, 131, (132), 135, 140, 141, 145, 146, 149, 152, 164, (165), 166, 173, 174, 177, 191, 197, 198, 205, 215, (230).
 Pottillius (?), 38.
 Reggio, library of S. Spirito, 247.
 Theocletus, 2.
 Theodorus, 74.
 Theodorus δ ἀντιγονίτης, 242.
 Theophanes, 55.
 Valla, Giorgio 10, 24, 26, 28, (38), 39, 40, 49, 51, 54, 57, 59, 61, 70, 77, 85, 87, 91, 93, 96, 99, 100, (102), (104), 110, 112, 114, 115, 123, 129, 130, 131, (132), 135, 140, 141, 145, 149, 152, 165, 166, 173, 177, 215, 230.
 Virgizio (Vergecius), Giorgio, 49.
 Xylalas, Theodosius,, 203.

T. W. ALLEN.

COMICORUM ATTICORUM FRAGMENTA.

Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta. Edidit
 THEODORUS KOCK. Vol. III. 1888.
 Leipzig: Teubner. Mk. 16.

DR. KOCK is to be congratulated on arriving at the completion of this important edition, on which he has spent so many years: *a maturiore aetate paene ad extremam usque senectutem*, he himself says. The work is throughout thorough and scholarly: the notes are terse, and the dryness of criticism is often relieved by happy illustrations; nor is the editor above adding a word of explanation when necessary. As far as can be judged he has neglected no source of information discovered since the appearance of Meineke's work; and the criticisms of Cobet, Herwerden, Blaydes, Naber, Ellis, and others, which have been published since that date, are by themselves sufficient to justify a new edition, even if the labours of Kock himself and the new fragments which he has brought to light did not found a claim for the publication of a fresh collection.

This, the third volume, is probably the most interesting of the series: for it contains the fragments of Menander. These fragments, having been to a large extent cited by Stobaeus for their merit, are more agreeable reading than the uninteresting fishy and culinary quotations of Athenaeus, which fill up so large a portion of the second

volume. Menander is not, perhaps, very profitable reading. A poet to whom marriage was a failure, sons and especially daughters a nuisance, and the duties of life more or less bores, is a poet after whom Euripides seems manly. Still his fragments are very pleasant reading, and not without utility, in so far as they inculcate prudence and moderation, though they seldom preach any higher virtue. Often too, his reflections irresistibly recall some well-worn English saying, so much of nature's kinship have they. Thus 'Man is born to sorrow as the sparks fly upward' is like *Ἀνθρώπος ἰκανὴ πρόφασις εἰς τὸ δυστυχεῖν*. 'Hope deferred maketh the heart sick' is like *πρᾶγμ' ἔστ' ἐπίπονον τὸ προσδοκᾶν*. 'To be wroth with one we love Doth work like madness in the brain' resembles *ὁ μέγιστον ἀγαπῶν δι' ἐλάχιστ' ὀργίζεται*. And sometimes he rises very far indeed 'supra soccum,' as in that solemn verse *ἅπαντα σιγῶν ὁ θεὸς ἐξεργάζεται*, and in the famous sentiment, *ὃν οἱ θεοὶ φιλοῦσιν ἀποθνήσκει νέος*. All this however, is very tragical mirth, and much nearer Euripides than Aristophanes. There was not much fun in Menander: and of the little there was less than its fair proportion has been preserved in these fragments. It was as a sentimentalist rather than a comic poet that Menander was the most popular dramatist of the world for many centuries.

Aleiphron tells us that in his time all the world was still running to see Menander's Misers, and Lovers, and Superstitious Men, five hundred years after the author's death.

The Comic Fragments are a field in which the greatest English scholars have done some of their best work: scarcely a page is there without some fine critical correction of Bentley's or Porson's or Dobree's. It is satisfactory to find from Kock's pages that the torch of Greek criticism is still being handed on in England. On p. 89, fr. 312, Kock adopts a certain emendation of the late Bishop Wordsworth, ἄλμα for ἄλλα: several of Mr. Ellis's might have been adopted, not only mentioned: when Dr. Blaydes shall have published his Adversaria on these fragments, which have already gone through the press, no doubt the contributions of our countrymen will be considerably augmented. Among foreigners in recent years who have exercised their genius on the text the first place is occupied by Cobet. Perhaps Dr. Kock is a little too ready to place Cobet's conjectures in the text. Thus on p. 115, fr. 402, he reads with Cobet ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρων οὐς ἡπίκλῆρος ἢ καλῇ | μέλλει καθενδύσειν where the MSS. of Gellius give ΑΜΦΟΤΕΡΑΝΙΝ which is certainly the old reading ἀμφοτέρα νιν, and the better reading, for νιν is wanted. The Greeks said both ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρα and ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρα τὰ ὅτα: the Romans rather said *in utramque aurem*. Next to Cobet, Herwerden's emendations are most conspicuous and are often obviously right. We should have been glad to see more of them introduced into the text. Dr. Kock's own emendations are generally sensible and good, occasionally brilliant, and he is evidently a thorough metrical scholar. The caesura of the anapaest seems to be the rock on which emendators are most frequently wrecked. Even Cobet himself does not always escape: for instance, p. 175, he proposes ἐν ταῖς παραχαῖς μάλιστα τὸν εὖ φρονούντα δεῖ, where the MSS. give only φρονούντα: 'qua conjectura caesura corrumpitur.'

Some of the more striking of Kock's conjectures are the following: p. 91, ἡγορασμένον ἀραχμῶν ἄγω προβάτιον ἀνάπηρον δέκα, where the MSS. of Athenaeus give ἀγαπητόν, which is however defensible and scarcely succumbs before Kock's illustration; p. 109, πολλοὺς λυγισμοὺς ἢ πονηρία κυκλοῖ where Stobaeus had λυγισμοὺς—this, if we remember λυγισμῶν καὶ στροφῶν of Arist. *Ran.* 775, quite puts Cobet's λυγισμοὺς out of court; p. 186, τὰ πῖθον ἰσχὺν τῆς ἀληθείας ἔχει | ἐνίοτε μείζω καὶ πῖθον ὅλῳ: the MSS. of Stobaeus give

τὸ πῖθον, the sense evidently requires something like τὰ πῖθον, 'what is incredible'; p. 190, for ὅταν τύχῃ τις εὐνοοῦντος οἰκέτου | οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν κτῆμα κάλλιον βίῳ Kock prefers ὅταν ἀτυχῇ τις, which gives a stronger sense. Kock introduces this into the text, but this is scarcely justifiable. He is however more than justified in substituting, p. 214, ὑπεδέξαμην 'I conceived,' for ἐδέξαμην which never bears this sense: ὑπεδέξαμην, ἔτικτον, ἐκτρέφω, φιλῶ. His parallel from Plat. *Menex.* 237 is by itself sufficient to establish his conjecture: τῆς τεκούσης καὶ θρεψαμένης καὶ ὑποδεξαμένης. P. 236: on the word ἐκκορηθείης Aristoph. *Pax* 59, a scholiast says ὡς πον καὶ ὁ Μένανδρος φησι πολλάκις: Kock suggests Παλλακῇ, probably rightly. Dr. Blaydes had already suggested this to me. There are many other good conjectures in the volume; there are also many inferior ones: and there are places where Kock seems puzzled by a simple sentiment: thus on p. 210, ἔστι δὲ | γυνὴ λέγουσα χρήσθ' ὑπερβάλλον φόβος, Kock remarks 'quid sibi velit φόβος non exputo.' Surely φόβος is a fearful prodigy, a 'monstrum': as Juvenal says, if a friend gives up a deposit, it is 'prodigiosa fides,' so Menander says that a woman talking rightly is a prodigy, which, though not a chivalrous, is quite an intelligible, nor absolutely groundless observation. On p. 69 the words κανθάρων μελάντερος are quoted from Photius and Suidas. Kock adds the remark 'verbis κ. μ. bestiola significari videtur': surely the words refer to a person: perhaps some girl 'nigrior formica pice graculo cicada,' as Martial has it, was described as κ. μελάντερα. On p. 424, in an anonymous fragment where a sterile field is described, 'which, like ladies, attends only to appearances,' τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν σχῆμα διατηρεῖ μόνον, Kock is at a loss, although sense and construction are both fairly obvious, and reads ῥῆμα, connecting it with the next line, but giving no sense. On p. 242 Arsenius's remark is given that Menander called envy πρόνοιαν τῆς ψυχῆς: Kock rightly points out that πρόνοιαν is wrong, and suggests παράνοιαν: but it is very extraordinary, when he himself reminds us that Socrates called envy 'the saw of the soul,' that he should not see that πρόνοια is to be here read for πρόνοιαν.

Kock and Meineke seem both to have missed a probable emendation in a fragment, p. 212: φιλόνομος δ' ἐστὶ καὶ μία γυνὴ | εἰς μῆνιν. Here Herwerden suggests καὶ λίαν omitting εἰς μῆνιν, which occurred to me also, but I now see that the true reading is *μαρά*. This word *μαρός* was often applied to a woman,

as a pestilent creature, cf. Arist. *Lysist.* 253, *ἄμαχοι γυναῖκες καὶ μισαί*: here *ἄμαχοι* corresponds to *φιλόνικος* in the text; cf. also Frag. 535 (K) *γυναῖκας ἐπλασεν ὡ πολυτίμητοι θεοί | ἔθνος μισρόν*.

In a fragment on love from Stobaeus, p. 67, Menander says that those who are not taken captive in youth pay the penalty by loving more violently in old age.

οἱ δ' εἰς τὸ γῆρας ἀναβολὰς ποιούμενοι
οὗτοι προσπατοῖν οὖσι τοῦ χρόνου τόκους.

Propertius probably had this passage in his mind when he wrote 'Saepe venit magno fenore tardus Amor.' The MSS. of Stobaeus vary between *τοῦ χρόνου* and *ὠραίου*. This discrepancy indicates a word which the copyists could not make out; it is strange that *τάρχαίω* has not been suggested: these men pay interest as well as principal. I now find Hirschig has anticipated *τάρχαίω*.

P. 152, fr. 530, l. 17 *seqq.*: εἰ μὲν τι κακὸν ἀληθὲς εἶγες, Φειδία, | ζητεῖν ἀληθὲς φάρμακον τοῦτον σ' ἔδει· | νῦν δ' οὐκ ἔχεις· κενὸν εὐρηκα τὸ φάρμακον | πρὸς τὸ κενόν· οἰήθητι δ' ὠφελεῖν τί σε· | περιμαζάτωσάν σ' αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν κύκλῳ· καὶ περιθεωσάτωσαν.

In the third verse read *κενὸν αἶρε καὶ τὸ φάρμακον* | *πρὸς τὸ κενόν· οἰθύντα δ' ὠφελεῖν τί σε* | *περιμαζάτωσάν σ' αἱ γυναῖκες κ.τ.λ.* The sense is: 'you have a trivial ailment: you need apply only a trivial remedy: but if you *think* it does you any good, let women rub you and lustrate you.'

P. 167, fr. 550, 551: Clemens Alexandrinus quotes these fragments, in the first of which Menander says every man has a good genius, but no bad genius: in the second that every god is good, or good in every respect. Clement carefully tells us the words may bear either meaning:

ἅπαντα δ' ἀγαθὸν εἶναι τὸν θεόν.

The emendations mentioned by Kock (*ἀγαθὸν οἶομαι εἶναι*, Dobree: *ἡγοῦμαι ἀγαθὸν εἶναι*, Kock) are not likely; I think *εἶναι* τὸν is a corruption of *ἐννοητέον*, 'we must conceive of every god as good,' or 'conceive God to be good in every respect.' τὸν θεόν cannot be sound: for if it were, the ambiguity noticed by Clement would not be in the words. It is also to be noticed that in Clement's comments on the passage *εἶναι* does not occur; and that the verbal *νομιστέον* precedes.

On leaving Menander we come back to Athenaeus and his cooks: and there is plenty of fun to be derived from these bragging artists. Anaxippus gives us a cook

who varies his dishes according to the profession or age of the guests, p. 296, vs. 41:

ὅταν ἐγγὺς ᾖ τῷ δ' ἡ σορὸς ἀρτύω φακῶν
καὶ τὸ περιδείπνον τοῦ βίου λαμπρὸν ποιῶ.

Here *ᾖ τῷ δ' ἡ σορὸς* is a good conjecture of Kock's own for *ἦν δὲ ὁδ' ὕστερος* of the MS. Dobree had proposed *ᾖ δ' ὁ σταυρός*, but Athenians were not crucified. Hegesippus tells us of a cook (p. 312) the odour of whose dishes was like the voice of the Sirens: no one could pass by until he was dragged away by a man with nostrils gagged. Sosipater's cook (p. 314) claims a knowledge of architecture, astronomy, and military science. Among other things he must *τοῦτ' ἀνίον ὀρθῶς καταβαλέσθαι*, (vs. 39) a passage which strangely puzzles Dr. Kock; *ὀπτάνιον* is *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* for *θεμέλιον*. Euphron exhibits an artist who found everything else anticipated by previous masters; so he made stealing his speciality. In this passage, p. 318, several emendations have been overlooked: in v. 19 πολλοὶ γέροντες should be *πολιοὶ γέροντες*. At l. 24, the thief-cook addressing his favourite pupil, who is rivalling his master at thieving, describes how that pupil forced sacrificers to sacrifice several victims, instead of one, stealing parts of the victim as it was sacrificed:

τὸ γὰρ ἦπαρ αὐτῶν πολλάκις σκοποῦμένῳ
καθεῖς κάτω τὴν χεῖρα τὴν μίαν λαθὼν
ἔρριψας εἰς τὸν λάκκον ἱταρῶς τὸν νεφρόν.

Here *τὴν μίαν* should be *τὴν λαίαν*. The left hand was the hand of thieving, (furtifica laeva). *MIAN* and *LAIAN* are practically the same word.

Euphron claims even the poetic art as part of a cook's education; Damoxenus tells us that Epicurus was a cook. The line is corrupt:

A. μάγειρος ἦν κάκεϊνος, οὐκ ἦδει θεοί.
B. ποῖος μάγειρος;

For *οὐκ ἦδει θεοί* I suggest *οὐκ* (or *ἡ οὐκ*) *ἦδησθ'* *ὅτι*; cf. Arist. *Nub.* 229, *ταῖτας μέντοι σὺ θεὸς οὐσας οὐκ ἦδησθ'* *οὐδ' ἐνόμιζες*; cf. also Plaut. *Bacch.* i. 2, 13. Hirschig gives *ὡ γῆ καὶ θεοί* which is adopted by Kock. But in the first place this could scarcely have been mistaken: secondly, there is an obvious objection to place it in the mouth of either speaker.

Diphilus having been included in the second volume, fragments like these form the major part of the longer citations after

Menander. But there is an interesting fragment of Apollodorus of Carystus quite Aristophanic in tone where the pleasures of peace are commended. Fortune is blamed for preferring to see the Greeks at war (p. 281):

ἐξὼν ἱλαροὺς παίζοντας ὑποπεπωκότας
αἰλουμένους ἰδεῖν.

The MS. gives ὦδαι for ἰδεῖν, which is my own conjecture. There must be some mysterious objection to it, which I do not see. I do not understand Kock's σποδεῖν.

Of the new fragments which have for the first time been included in a collection the most interesting is the anonymous one, p. 420, found by Weil among the Egyptian papyri: in which a young man describes with all the ardour of a convert how he has found salvation in a philosophic school. It has some hard critical nuts to crack, which will repay the critic to attempt. I have not much more to add at present, but I may remark that on p. 302 the word lost after γέλῳσας¹ is probably ἡρέμα: that on p. 354 in the line αὐτοὺς παρασίτους τοῦ θεοῦ τοὺς ἀηλίους the first word should be αὐτοῦ, 'parasites of the god himself'; that on p. 451 after the line γὰρ ὡ γέρον εἴ οἶδα καὶ τοῖς γέιτοσιν the words γέλωτ' ἐφλήσω probably occurred.

The main external defects are the want of a good index, a work in itself, and of a separate list of the new fragments included for the first time: these are now scarcely to be detected after a tedious comparison of the lists headed K and M: and a separate list is especially desirable in this volume, which contains an enormous number of new Adespota. In Meineke's edition these occupy seventy-three pages, and number 498; in Kock's they fill 286 pages, and amount to 1582. Dr. Kock must have been at immense pains to collect these fragments. They are gathered from scholiasts, grammarians, lexicographers, rhetoricians, fathers, historians, philosophers, anecdotes: many of them quoted as verses, and consequently already, for the most part, known, and already published with the Comic Fragments: but many have up to this lain hid, poetic gems of various brilliancy embedded in a matrix of prose quotation, now for the first time detected by a careful miner, now first polished and set by a skilful lapidary. But Dr. Kock has been too comprehensive, too anxious to include everything that could possibly be regarded as a comic verse, or part of a comic verse: he has, there is no doubt, often set before us as verse what is

not verse at all. I could give several probable instances of this, but one which is quite certain will suffice. It is a most astonishing blunder, and one which Dr. Kock was about the most unlikely man in the world to commit. On p. 543, fr. 768 is thus given:

ἐγὼ γὰρ ἦδη σπένδομαι, χῶ καιρὸς τῆς ἐμ.....

Dr. Kock's note is:

'Cramer, *Anecd. Ox.* II. 408, 22, σφενδόνη παρὰ τὸ σπένδω τὸ ἀναίρω κ.τ.λ., quae quamquam ipsa nocte sunt obscuriora, cum manifesto sint tetrametri iambici reliquiae ex comoedia excerpti, hic desse nolui. Vocem καιρὸς sequebatur vocalis.'

So Kock writes. But this is no comic tetrameter Iambic. These are the sublime words of St. Paul, 2 Tim. iv. 6,¹ translated in our version: 'I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand.' There have been great blunders on the part of great scholars, but this 'takes the cake,' to use a metaphor which is both Aristophanic and modern. And the reader would like to know what criterion Kock obeys in making up his verses, when he detects them in their bed of prose. On p. 480, he gives us this quotation from Theophylact Simocatta: ἡ δὲ πύχνη λυμαίνεται τοὺς καρποὺς ὡς ἀπαραίτητος τύραννος καὶ τοὺς ἰδρώτας ὁ τάλας τοῖς ἀνέμοις χαρίζομαι. From this Dr. Kock gives us fr. 381 thus:

τοῖσιν δὲ καρποῖς ἡ πύχνη λυμαίνεται
καὶ τοὺς ἰδρώτας τοῖς ἀνέμοις χαρίζομαι.

Why does he leave out the highly poetical ἀπαραίτητος τύραννος? Why does he leave out ὁ τάλας? These have as poetical a look as any part of the passage. The following may be nearer to the original verses supposing that there were verses at all:

τοῖσιν δὲ καρποῖς ἡ πύχνη λυμαίνεται,
τύραννος ἀπαραίτητος ὡς, καὶ τοὺς [ἐμῶν]
ἰδρώτας ὁ τάλας τοῖς ἀνέμοις χαρίζομαι.

Many instances like this will present themselves to a careful reader. But this collection of Adespota will probably prove the most interesting part of the book to scholars of a critical turn. It will give them employment and amusement for years to come, and in spite of occasional short-comings is one of the most valuable additions to classic literature which have appeared during many years.

But a second article would be necessary to do this work anything like justice. It is not

¹ The concluding words in the Epistle are καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἐμῆς ἀναλύσεως ἐφῆσται.

so great a work as Meineke's, and in all probability would not have been completed without that edition, but is lighter, handier, and more instructive; it brings the critique up to the level of recent scholarship, and ordinary readers who possess Dr. Kock's edition, can dispense with both of Meineke's, between which this occupies a middle position

in respect of bulk. The tone of comment is pleasant, and not generally discourteous except towards Herwerden, to whom Dr. Kock seems to owe a grudge. On the whole the world of scholarship will heartily congratulate Dr. Kock 'de provincia tam diu administrata decedenti.'

A. PALMER.

EURIPIDES AS A PHILOSOPHER.

De Euripide Philosopho. J. BERLAGE.
Leyden. E. J. Brill, 1888.

THIS treatise—a thesis for the Doctor's degree at Leyden—leaves the impression, which under the circumstances may be considered highly favourable, that the author, when he had finished it, was ready to write a much better one.

The book (208 pages) is divided and subdivided into numerous heads, such as 'Quid Euripides de rerum natura senserit', with sections 'De ortu et interitu rerum' etc. Under each head the passages bearing on the subject are collected and compared, with a view to obtaining for result the opinion of Euripides. Such a classified collection is useful in itself; but the results, though not for that reason useless, are in great part negative. We cannot trace in Euripides with any certainty the doctrines characteristic of Anaxagoras or of Socrates; he cannot be shown to have favoured Alcibiades, or to have differed in his views of contemporary politics from the average man of the later Periclean age. Such is the upshot. The discussion, though sensible in the main, shows traces of immaturity and imperfect consideration, as for example in the pages on the origin of religion (p. 79), which do not rise above the level of a prize essay. Meanwhile however we remain without any answer to the main question of all. Since the *dicta* of Euripides on almost all subjects are as inconsistent as we might expect from a dramatist, how is it that his works leave upon us, and produced on such contemporaries as Aristophanes, so strong an impression of 'tendency', and what is their tendency?

But on p. 166 we find some remarks which, if true, are of such wide bearing and great importance, that they seem rather late in their appearance:—

ἀρετῇ autem apud Graecos fuit perfectio illarum facultatum quae virum faciunt agendo strenuum et

iustum, cogitando subtilem; neque ea in homine otioso esse potest sed in cive tantum qui cum civium societate coniunctus vivit. Quamquam autem in illis sententiis nihil inest, cur non talem virtutem etiam Euripides sibi proposuerit, puto tamen aliter se rem habere. Omnia quae nuperrime enumeravi exempla virtutis excelsae; castitas singularis, mors petita non solum pro patria sed etiam pro singulorum hominum salute, iniuriae condonatae, praecepta quae non solum facta sed et cogitata sancta esse iubent cet., mihi videntur esse indicia rationum severiorum et religiosiorum, quas poetam, cum morum praeceptorum auctoritas dissoluta esset, in ancipiti illo bivio sibi elegisse supra disputavimus. Si praeterea reputamus vitam otiosam potius laudasse quam publicam, non inepta mihi videtur suspicio etiam virtutem ei observatam esse diversam ab antiqua illa ἀρετῇ, angustioris scilicet eandemque angustioris, morum sanctitatem magis spectantem quam virtutem civilem, omnino propius accedentem ad recentiorum saeculorum humanitatem.

These remarks, much more clear and comprehensive (notwithstanding the reference back) than anything which precedes them, seem to me on the whole as true as they are striking. They imply a view of the poet more complete and more just than is current in any book of authority, and it would have been well if Dr. Berlage had laid them down more distinctly as the foundation of his treatise. The offence of Euripides, as some judges then thought it, his profound merit and interest, as it may well appear to us, does not lie in this or that erroneous or pervertible maxim. It lies in this, that he was one of the first to desire, and to conceive as possible, the general improvement of man. He tends to place the worth and interest of human life primarily in the daily thought and daily action of the average individual, and next in those influences of common family life which bear most directly on the inner and outer life of the individual, after these, and as an instrument to these, in larger organizations and more ostentatious activities. In doing so, he necessarily becomes a critic, and a not very friendly critic, of the specially Hellenic morality made by and for the Hellenic *πóλις*. The improvement of education, the true 'sophistic', so far as that

term has meaning, had rendered him, and no doubt many others, dissatisfied with that vigorous and graceful, but incomplete and in some respects singularly boyish conception of human capacity, which delighted Pindar and does not appear to have gravely displeased either Aeschylus or Sophocles, either Herodotus or, we may almost say, Thucydides. Here, as I conceive, should be the starting-point of a satisfactory treatise 'de Euripide philosopho.' Whether the later ἀρετή deserves to be called 'more narrow' than the old Hellenic, may well be questioned, when we consider what the Hellenic πόλις was, and what things that morality which dissolved the πόλις, transmitted through the schools of Athens and many a ramifying channel, has since done in the world. It appears to me the most undoubtedly precious legacy of ancient Hellas, which bore its best offspring in the act of death.

That Dr. Berlage has here taken in hand an efficient instrument, may be seen from his subsequent treatment of Euripides' much misunderstood 'misogyny.' On the subject of women, the poet's *dicta* are as utterly inconsistent as on most other subjects. While on the one hand he exaggerates and embitters the depreciation of the sex which he borrowed from the general stock of Hellenic literature, on the other hand he is, as Dr. Berlage truly says, the first Greek after Homer who shows any approach to a just conception of what under normal circumstances women may and should be to society. Are these mere careless discrepancies, or are they different aspects of the same mind? Dr. Berlage chooses the second alternative. Because Euripides conceived, however vaguely, an advance in individual and family life, to which such women were necessary as the Hellenic life of the seventh, sixth, and fifth centuries did not and could not produce, therefore it was that he assailed so fiercely the type which he saw. Space will not allow me to do justice to this view, which I believe to be in the main profoundly true; it is at least highly interesting. It does not require us however to assume with the author, that the women of Euripides' time were specially depraved, which cannot be proved and, if true, would weaken Dr. Berlage's position.

In the theological opinions of Euripides the author endeavours to find a chronological development. The evidence appears insufficient; and the author is obliged to avow, that works so near together in time as the *Medea* and the *Hippolytus* show a widely dif-

ferent attitude. It is possible of course that between them lies a revolution in the poet's mind, but I do not think this will be made out.

On points of detail I must be as brief as possible. 'Ἥλι', ὡς μ' ἀπολέσας καὶ τόνδ'. 'Ἀπόλλων δ' ἐν βροτοῖς ὁρθῶς καλεῖ, ὅστις κ.τ.λ. (Eur. *Frag.* 781, 11): in re luctuosa additamentum molestum et putidum.' The play on the name is introduced for the sake of its associations with the most pathetic scene in Greek tragedy (Aesch. *Ag.* 1080). The context raises a doubt, whether the critic understood the point.—'αὐτὸς μὲν ἀνθρώπους οἴους δέ ποιῶ, Εὐριπίδης δὲ οἷοί εἰσιν.' From pp. 29 and 196 it seems that the author renders this *dictum*, according to the strangely persistent error, as if the infinitive to be supplied with δέ were εἶναι. This is not merely impossible by the form of the sentence, but makes Sophocles' criticism absurdly untrue. The infinitive supplied is ποιῶν: Sophocles admitted reality only within the limits imposed by poetic art, or rather by the Greek conception of dramatic art. Euripides, with or without reason, overstepped those limits.—'ἄνδρασι μὲν δόλαι βουλαί, θεῶν δ' οὐκέτι πίστις ἄραρε, *viris vel constant consilia perfida; non amplius vero iis constat fides decorum*' (*Med.* 413). There is no antithesis between the sentences above quoted; the clause θεῶν . . . ἄραρε is closely joined with δόλαι εἰσι βουλαί, the use of δέ being of the archaic fashion. 'Men are now proved perfidious and inconstant to their oaths.' The antithesis, 'woman's good fame is cleared', follows in the next lines, τὰν δ' ἐμὴν εὐκλειαν κ.τ.λ.—*Hec.* 799, ἀλλ' οἱ θεοὶ σθένουσι χῶ κείνων κρατῶν νόμος (νόμῳ γὰρ τοὺς θεοὺς ἡγοῦμεθα καὶ ζῶμεν ἀδίκῃ καὶ δίκῃ ὀρισμένοι). The author, partly following Nauck, finds a great difficulty in this νόμος, because, he says, it is quite different from the 'law which even gods must obey', of which we hear elsewhere. Certainly it is: but why introduce at all this alien conception? Religion, says the speaker truly or falsely, depends for its authority on our belief in moral distinctions. This belief depends on νόμος: therefore divinity itself depends on, and in this sense is *subject to*, νόμος. The meaning seems perfectly clear and sequent.

I must not proceed further either with these smaller criticisms or with the discussion of wider questions, though there is material of both kinds. Enough has been said to show that this book deserves reading, and that the author's further treatment should be favourably expected.

A. W. VERRILL.

UNTERSUCHUNGEN UBER PLATO.

Untersuchungen über Plato: Die Echtheit und Chronologie der Platonischen Schriften. Von CONSTANTIN RITTER, Repetent am Stift zu Tübingen. Stuttgart, 1888.

ENGLISH scholars are apt to look askance on 'quantitative criticism.' The method is mechanical and laborious; it has many drawbacks, and its advocates are often prone to assign to it an exclusive or an exaggerated importance. Examples of this might easily be drawn from the field of recent Shakespearean study. Yet within due limits and combined with tools of finer temper, this instrument is of unquestionable value, and has assisted in giving substantial certitude to the solution of some problems of exceptional nicety. The discussion of 'end-stopped lines,' 'weak endings,' and so forth, may have been wearisome, but it has helped to bring the characteristic differences between Shakespeare's earlier and later styles into a clearer light. And this is a real gain, although such determinations are of less consequence to the appreciation of a poet than is the corresponding discovery to the interpretation of a philosopher. The question of the order of composition of Plato's dialogues, complicated as it is with doubts of genuineness, is manifestly not less important than it has hitherto been obscure. And it is through quantitative criticism cautiously applied that there seems to be at last some hope of touching firm ground in this quagmire.

'How mean an instrument
May do a noble deed!'

For the present, it is enough to go back to the year 1881, when W. Dittenberger published his *Sprachliche Kriterien für die Chronologie der Platonischen Dialoge* (*Hermes* XVI., pp. 321-345). Having learned that the particle $\mu\eta\nu$, for example, was rarely or never used by the earlier Attic prose writers, he read through Plato with this in view, and found that the familiar formula $\tau\acute{\iota} \mu\eta\nu$ was entirely absent from about two-thirds of the whole number of the generally acknowledged dialogues, and that in about half of them $\gamma\epsilon \mu\eta\nu$ was nowhere to be found; while on the other hand, in the remaining works more than a hundred instances of $\tau\acute{\iota} \mu\eta\nu$; and about sixty of $\gamma\epsilon \mu\eta\nu$ appeared. Further, in three of these last-mentioned writings, the occurrence of both

formulae is much more frequent than in the rest. The line of investigation thus marked out by Dittenberger has since been pursued by many scholars, of whom M. Schanz's is much the most significant name. His paper in *Hermes* XXI., pp. 439-459, has given fresh importance to this whole inquiry. The number of test-formulae has rapidly grown, and the many paths of observation successively opened show a remarkable amount of convergence.

Constantin Ritter in the little book now before us (less than 200 pp.) has not only summed up the results of previous observations, but has added much patient labour of his own. The facts are presented by him with a completeness that has been lacking hitherto. His work is distinguished not only by thoroughness, but by much candour and critical acumen. His ultimate aim is to interpret Plato anew from himself, to see him as he is, and not through Aristotelian or other spectacles, and of this endeavour he has given a promising sample in his Appendix 'On the Movement of Thought and Fundamental Intuitions of the *Theaetetus*.' But he has realised the truth that until the order of the dialogues is determined, at least in outline, all study of their meaning and connexion must be comparatively crude, being baffled by an insuperable obstacle.

Herr Ritter has applied the linguistic or stylistic test not only to the dialogues 'now universally acknowledged by some critics,' but to the spurious and doubtful ones; and he has boldly undertaken to reconcile some rather grave discrepancies between what may be called the material and formal evidence. The case of the *Phaedrus* is still the most serious in this respect.

For the twenty-one genuine dialogues (the *Parmenides* and *Lysis* are regarded as doubtful) our author tabulates the results of more than sixty tests. He states moreover not only the number of pages contained in Hermann's edition of each dialogue, but the number of questions and answers in each, so that the actual occurrences of a particular form of reply may be compared with the possibilities of such occurrence. Another special feature of his work is of importance with regard to recent attempts to break up the *Republic*. He has made a separate register for each of the ten books, with, on the whole, a remarkable evenness in the result.

The tests here referred to consist chiefly

of certain particles, adverbs, adverbial phrases, and formulae of reply, together with the curious recurrence of the Ionic dative plural of the first and second declension, a peculiarity which some of the orators seem to have anticipated. But our author is not content with tabulating observations; he discusses their bearings, and accounts for various inequalities, which show that an immediate inference from any single set of phenomena would be unsafe. The judicious remarks of Gomperz in his *Platonische Aufsätze* (1887) have had a wholesome effect.

It may be well to summarize a few of the more striking of such phenomena.

Τί μὲν; occurs more or less frequently in seven dialogues, and in fourteen not at all (but this includes the *Apol. Tim. Critias*, where there are few replies).

Τῷ ὄντι appears in eight, to the exclusion of ὄντως: four have ὄντως only, five both, three neither.

Σχεδόν is in eight dialogues always followed by τι, in six never, in one hardly ever.

Ὅσπερ prevails in some dialogues, καθάπερ not less markedly in others.

Τὰ νῦν or τὸ νῦν for νῦν occurs with varying frequency in six dialogues, singly in five, but in ten never.

Some dialogues (and only some) show an abhorrence of hiatus,¹ particularly in using πότερον, not πότερα, before a vowel, whereas before a consonant πότερα is preferred.

Εἰς or κατὰ δύναμιν is absent from twelve dialogues, but is frequent in six.

Lastly, the Ionic dative plural occurs only in five dialogues, and that with varying frequency.

The point to be observed is that (making allowance for the obvious fact that the reply test is not applicable to the *Timaeus* and *Critias*) the same dialogues have in every column the preponderance of instances. It is a case of 'concomitant variations.'

The main results of this elaborate inquiry are as follows:—

1. Now, if not before, it is clearly proved that the *Sophistes*, *Politicus*, *Philebus*, *Timaeus*, *Critias*, and *Leges*—in this order, or nearly so—form a separate group, and are the latest written. Ritter's peculiar view, that the *Philebus* is contemporary with the earlier books of the *Laws*, the *Timaeus* and *Critias* with the later books, is hardly made out, though he has something to show for it.

¹ This has been noticed in a general way by Blass and others. It is a rhetorical feature.

2. It is made extremely probable that the *Republic*, *Phaedrus*, *Theaetetus*, form a central group, of which the exact order remains uncertain. Ritter thinks that the two lesser dialogues may have been composed during occasional intervals in the prosecution of the *magnum opus*.

3. However this may be, the *Parmenides*, if genuine, cannot be much earlier or much later than the *Theaetetus*. It must belong to the central group.

4. All the other dialogues are earlier than these nine or ten. The *Phaedo*, *Euthydemus*, *Cratylus*, *Symposium*—and the *Lysis*, if genuine—are doubtfully indicated as the latest of the earlier set.

5. With regard to the *Republic*, the first book shows remarkably few signs of the later manner, but these few (including *αἰτιῶν* 345E) are significant. Herr Ritter seems disposed to think that the work may have been so far begun and cast aside and taken up again after an interval. But he refuses to follow the disintegrators beyond this point. The eighth book, which has been supposed to ignore the sixth and seventh, has more indications of 'lateness,' according to his tests, than any other.

6. Of the doubtful and spurious dialogues, some follow the earlier, some the later manner, while some (thus self-athetized) have imitated both impartially.

In this brief notice I can do little more than call the attention of Platonic students to a work which, although of modest dimensions, exhibits proof of great industry and of considerable insight. I hope at some future time to find an opportunity of discussing more at length some of the many interesting topics which it suggests.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

NOTE.—In hinting that the first and most important of the above results might have been taken as proved, I refer to the contribution to this very subject which was contained in an edition of the *Sophistes* and *Politicus* published at Oxford in 1867 (General Introduction, pp. xix.-xlv.). It is true that the collection of instances there exhibited is incomplete, relying partly, as it did, upon the work of Ast, who, as a lexicographer, is not to be compared with Ellendt or Bétant. But the argument, if it has been little noticed, at least remains unrefuted, and while the tests employed (with the exception of the Ionic dative-plural-form) were different from those collected by Ritter, the conclusion to which they pointed, so far as it concerned the *Sophistes*, *Politicus*, *Philebus*, *Timaeus*, *Critias*, and *Leges*, was substantially the same with his.

This fact is the more observable, as the volume in question has no place in his list of 'Citirten Schriften;' and it may therefore be assumed that inquiries wholly independent of each other have led to this coincidence of result.—L. C.

SELECTIONS FROM POLYBIUS.

Selections from Polybius. Edited by JAMES LEIGH STRACHAN-DAVIDSON, Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College, Oxford. Clarendon Press, 1888. (Large 8vo., pp. xviii. 690.) 21s.

THE plan and division of this work are as follows:—Preface (pp. ix–xviii.); Prolegomena (pp. 1–80); Text (pp. 83–626); Appendix (pp. 629–670); Index (pp. 673–690), and three Maps at the end. Turning first to the text, where Mr. Strachan-Davidson follows Hultsch, with a conservative bias in favour of the older editors, we find the ‘extracts’ from Polybius divided into forty-four ‘sections,’ to each of which a distinct title is prefixed. By another principle peculiar to this edition the text is continuously subdivided into ‘chapters,’ 409 in number, and reference is further facilitated by the introduction of Bekker’s notation in the margin, and by the restoration, inside each ‘chapter,’ of the ‘verses’ of the earlier editors. This has sometimes a curious effect, as on p. 98, where the beginning of Mr. Strachan-Davidson’s ‘chapter’ does not correspond with the beginning of the chapter in the other editions. It would have been convenient if the lines on the pages had been numbered; at present the references in the indices are only to pages of the volume. Further help is given to the reader by the use of head-lines and a running analysis in the margin, including dates in heavy type. Into the body of the text, between the ‘chapters,’ where a gap in the story occurs, are inserted short ‘introductions’ to supply the necessary connexions. The editor warns us (p. xv. n.) that these ‘Introductions’ are not preliminary summaries of what follow in the text. The appearance of their being so would perhaps have been avoided, if they had not been numbered to correspond with the ‘chapters,’ which they precede. To the text are subjoined notes, which have only one fault, that they are too few. The editor certainly shows himself in his notes of no mind to spare the average student constant recourse to his *Lexicon*, and other works of reference. This economy may have advantages, yet it is not easy to see on what principle the line has been drawn. Few authors employ a more outlandish vocabulary than Polybius, few employ common words in more unexpected senses. A great many

cases are noticed or translated in the notes, but not a few of perhaps equal claims are left unshriven. Notes on the Polybian sense of such words as *οικονομία*, *δυναστεία*, *ἦθος* would not have been amiss: *ἐφοδιάζω* obtains recognition but not *στιβαδοκοιτῆν*, *ὑπέρθεσις* but not *ὑπαρξίς*, *σύνταξις* but not *συμπολιτεία*, and so on. The *Prolegomena* on the peculiar uses of words are so admirable that one only desires they should be increased. Mr. Strachan-Davidson cannot expect all his readers to possess Schweighäuser. The Polybian use of *ἀλυσίς* (4, 76, 5) is not even in ‘Liddell and Scott.’ A note or index on the Greek terms for Roman officers, institutions, and articles would not be superfluous. It would also be an improvement if the explanation of a word were always given on its first occurrence. It is not uncommon to find instances such as *ἐπιβολή*, which occurs more than a dozen times in the first 150 pages, and is only explained on p. 547; so for *φαντασία*, *πραξικοπεῖν*, *ἀθεσία*, *φιλοτίμως*, *βίος*, and others. The editor might reply that a reference to the Index II. would show whether a word has been noticed, and direct the reader to the page where he will find it explained; but what is the reader to do in a case such as *εἰσφορά*, which occurs on p. 103, is noticed on p. 118, and is not given in the index at all? The reader will also probably desiderate more frequent cross-references in the notes, and though the index may guide him to a note in which a word is explained, it will do little to guide him to the numerous passages in the text where the word occurs. Similar criticisms apply to the notes and index of historical or material import. They are admirable as far as they go, but they stop short rather oddly, and a great deal of knowledge seems to be taken for granted in the reader. Polybius sometimes uses the Olympiad, but of this chronological device and its history the reader will get no explanation here. He must also find out for himself whether there was an eclipse of the moon in 168 B.C. and what its exact date (p. 533), and he must go to the chronologists for the dates of sundry events incidentally mentioned, as for example the attack of the Gauls on Delphi (p. 139). He will look in vain to his editor for any direction in regard to the legendary origins of the Achaean Dodekapolis (p. 147), the historic claims of

Athens to Delos and Lemnos (p. 556f.), the Byzantine *συμπολιτεῖ* (p. 410), and the reforms of Prytanis (p. 157). Polybius may omit the Athenian *ἀρχή* from a comparison of imperial powers (p. 84), and represent the Spartan Ephors as democratic magistrates (p. 231) without comment or remark. The Carthaginian Zeus is to be no stumbling-block to the reader (p. 164), nor a Carthaginian trierarch a problem (p. 131). References made by Polybius to previous passages in his text must frequently be worked out by the reader unaided (pp. 162, 325, 408).

Two mistakes unnoticed in the table of *Errata* may here be mentioned. On p. 230 for *μοναρχία* the second time must be read *τυραννίς* (cf. Polyb. 6, 4, 3), and on p. 237 'ignis et aquae interdictio' is identified with sentence of death.

For the *Prolegomena* and *Appendix* (apart from their arrangement), there can be nothing but praise. The arrangement is indeed open to exception, for it is curious to find some six and twenty luminous pages on the 'Life and Writings of Polybius' sandwiched in the Appendix between an excursus on the site of Spanish Carthage and an 'Additional Note on Cannae,' while a long note on 'Jovem lapidem jurare' figures as *Prolegomena* VIII. It is not exactly a justification of this arrangement that the Preface anticipates to some slight extent the Appendix; for an editor who is at once so competent and so reticent as Mr. Strachan-Davidson must not be allowed to repeat himself, while anything worth saying by him remains unsaid. Whatever he says, is a model of lucid, terse, consequent English, and his own style has certainly not been formed on that of Polybius. The English of this book is indeed, much better reading than the Greek. It is not however the style alone that is to be commended. *Prolegomena* IV., on the Battle of Cannae, taken in conjunction with the 'Additional Note' and Plan I. should settle the problems discussed, and if Appendix I. on the site of Spanish Carthage with Plan III. is less definitive, it is a not less masterly exposition of topographical autopsy applied to illuminate historical and archaeological problems. If in the other chapters of the *Prolegomena* the editor has less scope for originality, he shows to equal advantage as a lucid and logical expositor. His work throughout will be found to exhibit a sober, independent, and slightly conservative tendency, as against lovers of the last new hypothesis; and work of this character is eminently wholesome and fit for educational

purposes. That student indeed will be very far above the average who can study Mr. Strachan-Davidson's work without being much the better for his pains.

There are three principal grounds upon which the study of Polybius is recommended; he is a truth seeker and teller, he is an exponent, according to his light, of the now resuscitated doctrine of the Unity of History, and his work is the principal library record and monument of an important age. These merits, even if sometimes exaggerated, are considerable. In regard to the last point it must, however, be admitted that Polybius is not the only authority, that he is not a highly graphic authority, and that he covers too much ground to be everywhere primary. If any one unacquainted with Polybius is led by the allusions in Mr. Strachan-Davidson's Preface to hope that he may rise from a perusal of the work with the same lively vision of the 'Age of Polybius' as is afforded, for other times and places, by the works of Aristophanes or of Cicero, he will be disappointed. Nor is it given to any author of any age to supersede all other sources, and students in want of a picture of the age of the Scipios are not to be limited to the covers of Polybius. The references in Mr. Strachan-Davidson's notes to some extent suggest this consideration, but it is a pity perhaps to introduce the *Selections*, and the somewhat bald and abstract narrative therein contained, as if they could render a whole age intimately accessible, or relieve posterity from the burden of consulting other authorities. To take a particular example, who will be content to derive the story of the Achaean Federation and its leaders from Polybius alone, although that is a topic where he ranks as the prime authority? This tendency to the apotheosis of particular authorities to the exclusion of others, even if inferiors, is not altogether a good method even for ordinary students, and their education. There is no question, however, that Polybius preserves a vast quantity of facts of interest and importance, and that the study of these matters of fact in his pages is interesting and instructive, in spite of the poverty of his thought and language. That he is remarkable for historical honesty, and singularly free from bias and prejudice is also apparent, and these virtues go some way to atone for the lack of moral enthusiasm not unjustly charged against him. He combines with his honest appreciation of facts a somewhat doctrinaire method of viewing the succession of events known to him, which

has earned him high commendation in some quarters. If it must be admitted that he shows a right and perhaps a remarkable appreciation of the historical mission of Rome down to his own time, it should also be pointed out that his philosophical explanations and his prophetic anticipations in regard to that mission are not characterised by complete historic sagacity. His attempt to explain Roman history in terms borrowed from Greek experience and philosophy is in fact a failure and a warning; what is now to be learnt from it is chiefly a caution to avoid repeating similar errors on a larger scale in our own case. On these and other defects in his author Mr. Strachan-Davidson hardly dwells in this edition. It must however be admitted that elsewhere he has pointed out the unsuitability of Polybius for the purposes of ordinary students with ruthless candour. In the charming essay which Mr. Strachan-Davidson contributed to the *Hellenica* (1880) he remarks: 'With all his excellences it is not probable that Polybius will ever be widely read. He cannot command the tones to sway or impress the mind. His book remains a storehouse from which the historian and the antiquary may draw, rather than a possession to enrich the mind of the ordinary reader.' And again: 'Although hardly any writer has said more interesting things than Polybius, he is tedious and uninteresting as a whole. It is characteristic of the man that the fragments should be the most valuable part of his work.' After further and equally just criticism Mr. Strachan-Davidson asks: 'Would it be well for ordinary classical students to give up any one of these [Thucydides, Tacitus, Herodotus] to spend the time over Polybius? It

must be confessed that Polybius as a writer cannot stand for a moment in the light of such a comparison.' Why then these *Selections*? Reduced to a third of their present bulk they would still have afforded a sample of the honest poverty of Polybius, sufficient for the ordinary student, while Mr. Strachan-Davidson's own papers, wherever printed, would certainly deserve and obtain the diligent consideration of all serious students of Roman antiquity. There seems to be, in fact, either too much or too little of Polybius in this volume. A much smaller selection would serve the purposes of a literary sample, or of a school book, while the more advanced student cannot really confine himself to what he finds here. Yet if these tentative remarks are refuted by practical experience, and the scholarly labours of Mr. Strachan-Davidson succeed in winning a substantial position for Polybius in the academic curriculum, no one will be better pleased by that refutation than the present writer, who, in common with many engaged in academic teaching, regrets the limitations and want of variety in the established courses of study. It is at any rate certain that Mr. Strachan-Davidson's volume gives Polybius, so to speak, such a chance as he has never had before of taking rank with the authors hitherto almost exclusively studied. Seeing as clearly as any one the demerits of Polybius for educational purposes, Mr. Strachan-Davidson deserves all the more commendation for undertaking, in the interests of education, a work which, if it prove successful, will owe almost everything to the industry, skill, and judgment of the editor.

R. W. MACAN.

THE CAMBRIDGE EDITION OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press by HENRY BARCLAY SWETE, D.D. Cambridge, at the University Press. 1887. 7s. 6d.

THE Syndics of the Cambridge University Press have earned the gratitude of all biblical scholars by having fairly taken in hand the preparation of a critical edition of the LXX; and they may be congratulated on having found an editor so competent for

the main purpose, so careful, and so trustworthy, as Dr. Swete. Though I am not without a personal regret that my own University has not thought fit to mark the close of the present century by undertaking, with the help of new materials and a better method, a revision of the great edition which it began to publish at the close of the last century, I cannot help rejoicing that the great school of experts in biblical Greek which has grown up at the sister University in the course of the present generation has

resolved to bring to bear upon the LXX. the experience which it has gathered in the fields of New Testament criticism. There is, moreover, a kind of moral fitness in the work being undertaken at Cambridge, for it was at Cambridge that the first conception of it was formed. Bishop Pearson, at that time Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity, in a preface to the Cambridge reprint (1665) of the Sixtine text, expressed a hope, which did credit to both his insight and his scholarship, for an edition of the LXX. which should gather together not only the various readings of the MSS. but also the quotations in the Fathers: he added the further hope that Isaac Voss should undertake such an edition. But for a hundred and fifty years the hope remained unfulfilled: and the edition of Holmes and Parsons which endeavours to fulfil it is unfortunately so unequal in its execution as to be entirely inadequate to the requirements of modern philology. A student who takes the trouble to go through the hundred and forty-two volumes of MS. collations of which the work is a digest, and which are still accessible in the Bodleian Library, will find among them some collations which contain internal evidence of the care with which they were made; but many of them are obviously the work of unskilled hands, and some of them are fragmentary. The work of collation has practically to be done over again: and the present volume is the first outcome of a scheme for undertaking it which was originally framed and begun by Dr. Scrivener, and which has since been adopted, with some modifications, by the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press.

The scheme contemplates two editions: one an edition corresponding to that of Holmes and Parsons, and containing a full *apparatus criticus*; the other a manual edition, containing only the variants of the more noteworthy uncial MSS. The two editions will agree with one another, and differ from all previous editions, in giving neither the Sixtine text nor a revision of it, but the text of a single uncial, Codex B, supplementing the *lacunae* of that text from the text of Codex A. The scheme is the best that could have been devised. More than one generation must pass before a critically revised text of the LXX. will be possible: what is needed in the meantime is a collection of the materials, referred to the standard of a single ancient text, and a manual edition of that text for the every-day use of students.

Of such a manual edition the present NO. XXI. VOL. III.

volume is the first instalment. The absence of such an edition has been for many years a standing reproach. There is probably no ancient book of even secondary value, of which the printed editions are so far behind the modern standard of scholarship. The text which was issued under the auspices of Sixtus V. in 1586(7) has been frequently reprinted, and the words on the title-page of most of the reprints, 'juxta exemplar Vaticanum,' have sometimes misled even scholars into the belief that the text was that of Codex B. There are, indeed, grounds for thinking that some of the editors of the reprints, overlooking the direct statement of the Sixtine editors that they had collated other MSS., have themselves believed that they were reprinting the text of Codex B. The error is more pardonable than the fidelity with which they have sometimes left even the printer's errors of the Sixtine text uncorrected. The mistakes which have been handed on from one reprint to another are almost incredible. As the number and importance of these mistakes are not generally known, I will give some examples, taken not from the whole work, lest it might be supposed that they were accidental slips bearing an insignificant proportion to the rest, but from a single document, the book of Ecclesiasticus.

In xii. 17 the MSS., including Cod. B, read *κατὰ ἂν ὑπαντήσῃ σοι*: Vulg. 'si incurrerint tibi mala.' The Sixtine edition, probably by a misprint, has *ὑπανθήσῃ*: this impossible reading is retained in Jean Morin's Paris reprint of 1628, in the Oxford reprints of 1817 and even of 1875, and in Tischendorf's editions.

In xxii. 11 the MSS. read (with only the variant *ἐξέλειπε* for *ἐξέλιπε*) *ἐπὶ νεκρῷ κλαῖσον ἐξέλιπε γὰρ φῶς*: Vulg. 'supra mortuum plora defecit enim lux eius.' The Sixtine text, probably by a misprint, omits the words *ἐξέλιπε γὰρ*, and makes nonsense of the passage. But the omission is found also in Jean Morin's reprint, and in the Oxford reprints, including that of 1875. The words are restored in the London edition of 1653, the Cambridge edition of 1665, and in the editions of Bos, Breitinger, Holmes and Parsons, and Tischendorf.

In xxxvi. 14 (16) (19) the MSS. read *πλησὺν Σιών ἀρεταλογίας σου καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης σου τὸν λαόν σου*: Vulg. 'reple Sion inenarrabilibus verbis tuis et gloria tua populum tuum.' The Sixtine editors, by an obvious misunderstanding of an *αι* (for *ε*) in the MS. before them, read *πλησον Σιών ἀραι τὰ λόγια σου*: and this extraordinary blunder

is repeated in the Oxford reprints, including that of 1875.

In xxxvii. 6 the Sixtine edition has *μη ἀμνημοσύνης αὐτοῦ*, an impossible reading which probably comes by a printer's error from the Complutensian [Codd. S¹, 248] *μνημονεύσης*: in all other editions to which I have access the word is corrected to *ἀμνημονήσης*, but all the Oxford reprints retain the Sixtine blunder.

In xl. 21 the MSS. read *αὐλὸς καὶ ψαλτήριον γλυκαίνουσι μέλη*: Vulg. 'tibiae et psalterium suauem faciunt melodiam.' The Sixtine editors, probably having before them an itacized text, printed the impossible *μέλι*. Their mistake is left uncorrected in Jean Morin's text, in the London reprint of 1653, the Cambridge reprint of 1665, in all the Oxford reprints, and by both Bos and Tischendorf. The blunder is the less excusable because the phrase *γλυκαίνειν μέλη* occurs a few chapters later in the book, viz. in xlvii. 9.

In xlviii. 18 some editions have a mistake which is almost ludicrous. The MSS. read *ἐν ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ ἀνέβη σενναχηρίμ*: this was printed correctly in the Sixtine edition, but the last two words were separated by a rather shorter interval than usual. Consequently they were wrongly divided, and read as *ἀνέβησεν ναχηρίμ*, a mistake which first appears in the Latin translation which Sixtus V. caused to be published in 1588, where 'ascendit Nacharim' is read. Almost all subsequent editors have corrected the blunder; but the Oxford reprints perpetuate to the present day this dubious marriage of a corrupt use of a Greek verb with an unknown king.

It is obvious that while editions which retain blunders of this kind continued to be the chief editions in ordinary use, the study, philological or otherwise, of the LXX. could not be expected to make much progress. The publication of some one ancient text in an approximately accurate form is the first condition of that new study of the LXX. the importance of which in relation both to the textual criticism of the Old Testament and to the philology of the New Testament is beginning to be widely recognized.

The Cambridge committee, having resolved to publish such an ancient text, have done wisely in fixing upon the text of Codex B. Whatever may be ultimately found to be the critical value of that text—and I venture to hold the provisional opinion that it is the least valuable of the great uncials—it seems to be clearly better than that of

Codex A. for the purpose of the present edition, i.e. as a standard of comparison.

The work of the editor, Dr. Swete, in carrying out the scheme is marked by singular accuracy and soundness of judgment. The work of the editor of a single MS. requires both the one and the other. In a work designed only for scholars the former quality alone may suffice: the task of an editor is to reproduce his original, letter for letter. But in a work which is to serve also for the purposes of ordinary reference, and for beginners, a certain amount of discretion is necessary. The faithful reproduction of every orthographical peculiarity of a MS. would be, in such a work, needless for a scholar, and confusing to a beginner. It is consequently necessary for an editor to exercise his discretion in regard to the admission or rejection of certain forms of words. In the great majority of cases, the judgment of the present editor will probably commend itself to all who have given special attention to the subject. There are, however, some points on which I venture to hope that he will exercise his discretion differently when the present volume is revised, and before the other volumes appear.

1. It seems desirable to indicate, in some more marked way than that of a note among the variants in the margin, the insertion of words which are not in the governing MS., or the adoption of an interpretation, however legitimate, of the MS. text. For example, in Gen. xxii. 11 *ὁ δὲ εἶπεν* is supplied: a bracket or other mark should indicate this. In Gen. xli. 36 *ἀ* is supplied: it is quite possible that the omission of it in Cod. A is not accidental but intentional; in any case the word should be placed in a bracket. So also with the insertion of the article before *θεοῦ* in the singular instance of its omission, Ex. x. 17; of the clause *οὐδὲ ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου ἕως κτήνους* in Ex. xi. 7; of the words *δοῦναί σοι* in Ex. xiii. 5; and of *τῷ πλησίον* in Ex. xxii. 9 (8): in the latter instance there is the greater reason for some indication that the words are inserted by the editor, because the analogy of v. 12 (11) below raises a presumption that the words to be supplied, if any be supplied, should be rather *τῷ κυρίῳ* than *τῷ πλησίον*. A similar course seems desirable where the editor has varied the reading of the MS. on exegetical grounds: for example, an obelus or other mark should be appended to the *ὁ* which is read for the *οὐ* of the MS. in Lev. vii. 10 (20), and to the alteration of *θάμβος κύριος* into *θάμβος κυρίου* in 1 Reg. xxvi. 12: I have chosen these as examples because in neither case is the alteration imperatively re-

quired. There are also some cases of questionable interpretation of the MS. reading, to which attention might suitably be directed in a similar way: for example, in Gen. iii. 10, the *περιπαῖτος* of the governing MS. is interpreted by *περιπατοῦντος*: the Hebrew does not help us to choose, and *περὶ πάντος* will just construe. So also in Gen. xiii. 12 *ἐνσκήνωσεν* is interpreted by *ἐσκήνωσεν*: but *ἐνσκήνωσεν* is not less possible, for many words, which, like it, appear to be peculiar to patristic Greek really come from the LXX.¹

2. The case of orthography and of grammatical inflexions is more difficult. It is often impossible, as in the case of the New Testament, to determine for certain whether a given form belongs to the age of the translator or to that of the transcriber. The difficulty is complicated in the case of the LXX. by the uncertainty which exists as to the times at which the several portions of the translation were made. In the present state of our knowledge of Hellenistic Greek, by far the safest rules are that an editor should follow his MS., even though this may lead to the introduction of forms which are not found elsewhere, and that he should avoid uniformity. In the great majority of cases which admit of doubt Dr. Swete deserves our thanks for his adherence to these rules. But I venture to hope that he will adhere to them even more closely in future. The edition would be an even more important contribution than it is at present to Hellenistic philology if the MS. had been followed, instead of being altered, in such cases as the following: (a) the contracted dative of nouns; e.g. *δόσι* Gen. xlvii. 22, *δυνάμει* Ex. vi. 26, Num. i. 3, *κρίσι* Ex. vi. 6, *κρίσι* Gen. xlix. 30, *πόλει* Lev. xxv. 29, which are all altered by Dr. Swete into the corresponding forms in *-αι*: (b) the vocative of *θύγάτηρ* which, with the same MS. reading in each case, is written *θύγατερ* in Ruth iii. 1, but *θυγάτηρ* in Ruth ii. 2, 22: (c) the forms of *γίγνομαι*, among which certain of those in *γιν-* are as legitimate as those in *γεν-*; hence e.g. *παπαγίνῃ* might have been retained in

¹ I am indebted for several of the references in this paragraph to the Rev. H. A. Redpath.

2 Reg. i. 3: (d) the forms *ἐμμέσῳ*, *ἐγγαστρὶ*, might properly be left unaltered; they are too constant in the MSS. to be treated as the peculiarities of a single scribe; (e) such forms as the genitive *ἡμίους* for the more usual *ἡμίους* in Ex. xxvii. 5, and the dative *ἡμίον* for *ἡμίονοι* in Num. xxxii. 33, might also have been retained: the contractions are found in more than one MS. and in more than one passage: they are analogous to those of the Latin *-u* nouns; and the unfixedness of the inflexion of *ἡμῖος* is shown by the existence of the variant *ἡμῖος* in Phocian inscriptions (*τὸ ἡμῖον, ἐπὶ τῷ (ι) ἡμῖον* *Sammlung der griech. Dialecten-Inschriften* Nos. 1523, 16, 1555 *b* 12) and by the use of *ἡμῖον* as indeclinable in Byzantine Greek.

I will add, in conclusion, the further hope that the remaining volumes may be based on collations not of the autotype and facsimile editions, but of the actual MSS. themselves of Codd. A and B. The labour would no doubt be considerable: but the value of the results to be attained would amply justify it. I can only speak from experience of Codex A, and I will give but a single instance of the unsatisfactoriness of the results which come from using only the autotype. In Gen. xxvii. 23 the original reading can clearly be made out underneath the later corrections to be *ἦσαν γὰρ αἱ χεῖρες αὐτοῦ ὡς αἱ χεῖρες τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ*: this has been corrected by a much later hand to *ἦσαν γὰρ αἱ χεῖρες αὐτοῦ ὡς αἱ χεῖρες Ἡσαῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ δασεῖαι*: it is unsatisfactory that an edition like the present should print the text in its later form with merely the marginal note "*Ἡσαῦ* sup. ras. pl. litt. A*": the '*rasura*' being clearly that of the original *χεῖρες* of which only *χ* was left, at the end of a line, the remaining letters being written by the corrector in the margin. But I should like, at the same time, to bear testimony to the singular accuracy of Dr. Swete's work in the uncorrected and unobliterated passages: in the very few instances of discrepancy between my own collation and his, I have found on re-examination that Dr. Swete was right and I was wrong.

EDWIN HATCH.

PLUTARCHI MORALIA.

Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia recognovit
GREGORIUS N. BERNADAKIS. Vol. I.
Lipsiae, Teubner, 1888. 3 Mk.

THIS is the first instalment of a complete edition of the miscellaneous treatises on a

variety of subjects—religious, political, literary and physical—which go by the name of Plutarch's '*Morals*.' The volume contains, besides the two spurious dissertations 'on the training of children' and 'consolation to Apollonius,' the twelve treatises

'how a young man ought to hear poems,' 'on hearing,' 'on friendship and flattery,' 'on test of proficiency in virtue,' 'how to profit by our enemies,' 'on large acquaintance,' 'on fortune,' 'on virtue and vice,' 'care of health,' 'conjugal precepts,' 'the banquet of the seven wise men,' and the theosophical essay 'on superstition and atheism.'

No complete edition of the Greek text has been published since Wytttenbach's (Oxford, 1795-1830), which the editor did not live to finish, except that by F. Dübner in the Didot series (Paris, 1841). The former is not based upon the best MSS., and those which the editor used were only imperfectly collated; the latter professes to be based on a new collation by Contus of the Paris MSS., but there is nothing to distinguish the changes introduced on the authority of these from conjectures of the editor and his predecessors, there being no *apparatus criticus*. The edition of R. Hercher (Teubner, 1872) is vastly superior in a critical point of view to either of these, but owing to the premature death of the editor it did not extend beyond the first volume. The editor of the volume before us has undertaken a most difficult task and one from which most scholars would shrink in dismay—a thorough revision of the text with the help of the best MSS. M. Bernardakis is already favourably known to scholars by his *Symbolae criticae et palaeographicae in Plutarchi vitas et moralia* (Teubner, 1879), in which he has made many happy suggestions for the correction of the text, and by his spirited defence of his compatriot A. Korais (Coray) against the sneers of Cobet. M. Bernardakis in his preface, which extends to ninety-three pages, speaks modestly of his own labours, which must have been considerable in the examination and careful study of MSS.—all the more so because of the great want of uniformity in even the best, such as Paris E, those which are most trustworthy in some of the treatises being valueless in others. In the case of some of the treatises there are no good MSS. extant, but he speaks hopefully of a possible discovery by others, having been fortunate enough himself to light upon three—in the libraries at Milan, at Venice, and at the convent of Mount Athos, some of the readings in which confirm in a remarkable manner the conjectures of Xylander, Wytttenbach and Reiske. Not only a full list of all the known MSS., but a selection of readings from some of the best is given, as a test of their worth. In this respect

the editor has been able to supplement the researches of Treu.¹

The Preface concludes with some terse remarks on the general style of Plutarch (he takes no notice of his extraordinary fondness for the use of the participle—Prof. Gildersleeve's title 'polymetochic' would become him more perhaps than any other Greek author), and his use of certain words and forms of words. In Mr. Strachan-Davidson's notice of Hultsch's *Polybius*, Vol. I., ed. 2, in this Review,² attention is drawn to that writer's dislike and avoidance of the hiatus between two vowels. Plutarch had evidently the same dislike, and he frequently sacrifices the natural order of words in the sentence and uses different forms of the same word, merely in order to avoid the disagreeable effect of a concurrence of vowels. But it was perhaps beyond the editor's scope to enter into further details.

We now come to the text itself, which is based upon an independent study of the principal MSS., and must, so far as it goes, be accepted as the standard one. The editor has exercised a sound discretion in admitting only such conjectural emendations as carry conviction with them, and explain the origin of the reading which they replace. Being a Greek by birth, he has an instinctive feeling for the language, which is a very safe guide, and prevents him from accepting suggestions for the alteration of the text, even in deference to great scholars like Madvig. Attic forms he has not obtruded on his author, except where they can be found in other passages of Plutarch.

In the foot-notes, which are scanty, not only are the rejected MS. readings given, together with the name of the proposer of the reading by which they have been replaced, but reference also is made to the original source of quotations from classic authors—which Plutarch is so fond of making—whether from Plato, Homer, Aristotle, Thucydides, the Dramatists with their fragments, or the Lyric poets. This strikes us as a much more convenient and satisfactory method than that by which Kaibel has disfigured his edition of Athenaeus—viz. inserting them in the Greek text between brackets.

¹ *De codd. nonn. Paris. Plut. Mor. narratio*, Lauravinae 1867, *Ueber die handschriftliche Grundlage der Moralia*, Breslau Progr. 1877 and 1884, *Geschichte d. Uebersetzung von Plutarch's Mor.* Ohlau, 1881. According to Treu the best MSS. are Vienna 148 (not, as he writes, 184), Venice 250 (V²), Milan 82, Paris 1672 and 1956. The latter is pronounced by Bernardakis to be *facile princeps*.

² Vol. II. December, 1888, p. 319a.

We heartily wish that M. Bernardakis's life may be spared to complete not only the present work, the preparation for which has occupied so many years, and in the execution of which he has exercised, so far, such sound judgment, and combined sober criticism with extensive and accurate knowledge of his

author, but also the larger edition with a complete *apparatus criticus* which he promises. The present handy volume is a credit to modern Hellenic scholarship, and will be welcomed by all students and lovers of the Boeotian sage.

H. A. HOLDEN.

ZOSIMI HISTORIA NOVA.

Zosimi Historia Nova. Ed. L. MENDELSSOHN. Teubner. Leipzig. 1887. 10 Mk.

STUDENTS of the later Roman Empire have some reason to look forward to possessing within the next twenty years satisfactory texts of the later Greek historians. For a long time one has been obliged to make the best of the Bonn *Scriptores Byzantini*, a series of volumes on which the editors can in few cases be said to have deserved congratulation; in fact if one possessed the Paris edition of the seventeenth century, there would be no occasion to consult the Bonn edition of the nineteenth. But during the last few years C. de Boor, A. Reifferscheid, and now L. Mendelssohn have come to the rescue; and we have at last really sound texts of Theophanes, Theophylactus, Nicephorus Patriarcha, Anna Comnena and Zosimus. Using these new editions the historical student feels that he is standing on the firmest available ground.

The palaeographical starting-point for a new edition of Zosimus was determined by A. Kiessling in 1863, when he showed that Vatican cod. Gr. 156 was the only really important MS., as all the others are derived from it. Mendelssohn's text mainly depends on a collation of this codex made by Dr. A. Mau of Rome, whose skill in palaeography is well known. The Preface contains, besides an account of this MS., a discussion of the vexed question as to the date of the historian, an account of the laws of hiatus which he adopted with modifications from Polybius, and a valuable treatise on his sources. It is to be regretted that the editor has not added an *index verborum* as well as an *index nominum*. The value of M. de Boor's texts of Theophanes etc. is greatly enhanced by the excellent glossaries of Greek words with which he has provided them.

That Zosimus wrote between 425 A.D. and 502 A.D. is certain; the further limit is determined by the circumstance that Olympiodorus' work, which went down to 425 A.D. was used by Zosimus in the later portion of his history; the nearer limit by the fact

that Zosimus was one of the sources of Eustathius of Epiphania, who wrote in 502. But an observation of Tillemont, accepted by Mendelssohn, renders it possible for us to advance from 425 to 450: the French scholar pointed out that the words *ἐπὶ χρόνον συγχρόν* in ii. 38, 4 imply the abolition of the *folles* and the limitation of the burdens of the *prætura*, alleviatory measures which were passed by Marcian in 450. On the other hand it is not permissible to conclude from this passage that it was written after the abolition of the Chrysargyron by Anastasius in 501 (Preface, p. ix.) In future we may speak of Zosimus as a historian who flourished in the second half of the fifth century.

It is an interesting fact that Zosimus constructed his sentences according to regular laws of hiatus, imitating his model Polybius of Megalopolis, whose name (Πολυβίω) is the first word of his history. His laws however are not so strict as those adopted by Polybius. Mendelssohn gives a full account of the exceptions which Zosimus allowed himself and the means which he employed to avoid the collision of vowels (such as the use of *ὅσπερ* for *ὅς*, plural for singular, compound for simple verb, *ἀπρίως* for *ἀπρι*, &c.). On this subject I have a few criticisms and suggestions to make.

The 8th exception (I. i. p. xxix.) admitted by the editor is the case of proper names, *tam ubi præcedit nomen proprium quam ubi sequitur*. Nine apparent instances are mentioned; but Mendelssohn at the same time remarks that 'the author manifestly avoids hiatus when he can, even in proper names,' and on this principle would emend one of the passages where emendation is easy. I would observe that of these nine instances four at once disappear, namely (1) *ἄχρι παντός τοῦ βίου* 'Ιουλιανῶ, iii. 2, 4; (2) *οἶπῳ* 'Ιουλιανός, iii. 7, 2; (3) *προσῆκει* 'Ιουλιανόν, iii. 9, 4; (4) *ἐπετάχατο δὲ ἐν τούτῳ* 'Ιοβιανοί, iii. 30, 2. It seems clear that in the Græcized forms of Julianus and Joviani the consonantal pronunciation of the initial spirant was retained, and consequently there was no hiatus (just as in the case of *Οὐάλης*, *Οὐάλεττιανός*).

A fifth instance is (5) τῶν ἐν τῇ Λιβύῃ ἐν ἀδύλῳ καμένων, vi. 7, 6; but here I have no doubt that the hiatus is legitimate, not because Λιβύῃ happens to be a proper name, but because the vowel of the preposition ἐν has a tendency to be slurred (ἐν ἀδύλῳ) like the vowel of the preposition ἐς. This principle will explain several other passages which Mendelssohn would like to emend: ὁδοῦ εἰς i. 40, 2; λίμνῃ εἰς i. 58, 2; ἡμέρᾳ εἰς ii. 5, 4; τρίτῃ ἐν ii. 5, 5; ἥει εἰς iii. 10, 1. In another case (6) the hiatus is quite correct and serves a purpose: Ἴωνες δὲ καὶ Δωριεῖς οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ ἐξήκοντα, ii. 22, 2: the hiatus shows that ἐξήκοντα does not refer to the Ionian and Dorian but to τριήρεις in a preceding clause. Mendelssohn is wrong, I think, in saying *ubi et paucae et notae numeralis accedunt excusatio*, implying that the chief excuse is the accident that Ἀσία is a proper name. It seems to me that the *paucis* is the one and sole reason; and also that the hiatus not only does not require an excuse, but is desirable for the sake of the sense. (7) τῇ τοῦ Τερτίλλων ὑπάρχει τιμῇ occurs in vi. 7, 4, but as Mendelssohn himself has elsewhere recognized, passages of the Sixth book (of which only thirteen chapters remain) cannot be fairly adduced to prove anything, as the author left it incomplete and unrevised. There remain two passages, one of which—(8) ὑπὸ Γαίνῃ ἔταξε iv. 57, 2—has been probably emended by the editor, who would write Γαίνην, and the other—(9) ἐν δὲ τῇ Ῥώμῃ Ἡλιοκράτης v. 35, 4—is left by itself. I think we may conclude that Mendelssohn is wrong in setting down *nomina propria* as a case in which Zosimus released himself from his law of synapheia, and that, whatever be the explanation of the one remaining passage, it certainly is not that Ῥώμῃ or Ἡλιοκράτης is a proper name.

In two passages Mendelssohn conjectures λαθραῖος for λάθρα in order to avoid hiatus (see p. xxxii.). It may be pointed out that it is only necessary to write λάθρα and the passages come under his fourth exception, (d) *in terminatione in a et oi exeerunt*; but it

is probable that the termination α should be added to the exception: cf. ἰδία ἔκαστον iv. 6, 2. ἰδία ὁκνοῦντας iv. 40, 3 ought also to be placed here.

In v. 24, 6 the circumstance that the statues of Athene of Lindos and Zeus of Dodona were not consumed in the conflagration of the senate-house is introduced thus: θαύματος δὲ τινος τηρικαῦτα γενομένου ἄξιον οὐ προσήκει παραδραμεῖν σιωπῇ. Mendelssohn would read *τι τηρικαῦτα γενομένου* to avoid the hiatus and give a construction to ἄξιον. It seems far more probable that ἄξιον was the marginal exclamation of delight written by some zealous pagan of the sixth century, and that a late copyist inserted it in the text at the expense of the construction. In the texts of ancient classical writers, as readers of Cobet know, the same word (ἄξιον, 'fine!') has more than once intruded itself.

In vi. 8, 1 I must protest against the ascription of an error to Zosimus which seems really due to the accidental omission of a word from the text. Jovius (or Jovian, as he is called by Olympiodorus), the Praetorian Prefect, who abandoned the cause of Honorius and went over to the usurper Attalus, is thus mentioned: Ἰόβιος ὁ τῆς αὐλῆς ὑπαρχος παρὰ Ἀττάλῳ καθεστωμένος. But we are told in 7, 2 that Lampadius had been appointed Praet. Pref. by Attalus. On turning to Olympiodorus, from whom Zosimus derived the facts, we obtain the clue: frag. 13 πατρικίος Ἀττάλῳ ὀνομασθεῖς. It seems highly probable that πατρικίος fell out between ὑπαρχος and παρὰ: 'Jovius, the Praetorian Prefect, has been made a Patrician by Attalus.' On the other hand, in the account of Stilicho's victory over Radagaisus (v. 26) Mendelssohn is right in rejecting the alterations of Ἰστρον proposed by Leunclavius and Reitemeier, for it is plain from many expressions in the narrative that Zosimus had somehow or other become possessed of the idea that the victory which was really won at Fiesole was won beyond the borders of Italy.

J. B. BURY.

FAUSSET'S CLUENTIVS.

M. Tullii Ciceronis pro A. Cluentio Oratio, with Explanatory and Critical Notes by W. YORKE FAUSSET, M.A. Rivingtons. 1887. 6s.

It is a pleasure to welcome this edition, which rises above the usual level of the

school-book, and evinces ability and scholarship from which we may hope for much in the future. The *Cluentius* is a very important speech from many points of view, and however good Ramsay's edition may have been in its day, a new treatment in English has been for some time a great

desideratum. Mr. Faussett's work has many merits: especially patient and fairly full exegesis and illustration; general lucidity of statement; sound construction of the text. The faults that strike me are a certain diffuseness (which however is an aid to clearness), a tendency to repetition, and an occasional lack of the precision which comes only of long devotion to study at first hand, and of a determined habit of probing other men's statements to the ground before accepting them. Mr. Faussett has, it may be hoped, a long career as a scholar before him, and will be enabled to win his way to the front in these as in other respects.

Nothing would be more pleasant to me than to be able to give minute attention in this review to every part of Mr. Faussett's book, which is indeed worth it; but space compels me to restrict myself, so I shall deal almost entirely with the Introduction and the explanatory Notes. It may seem ungracious to dwell on points concerning which I disagree with the editor, but I do so in the hope that he will speedily be able to issue the edition in a revised form, and that it may prove useful to draw attention to matters which seem to need reconsideration.

The work is in five sections: Introduction, Text, explanatory Notes, critical Notes, and a Glossary. This last elucidates about forty selected words, but the elucidations are so like in form to many of the explanatory notes that it is not easy to see what is gained by the separate treatment.

The Introduction first deals with the circumstances surrounding the speech and trial; then expounds fully and fairly the vexed questions raised by the subject-matter of the speech, many of them doubtless destined never to be solved. Every scholar who gives to these questions minute consideration will be apt to find reasons for dissatisfaction with every other scholar's explanations. This reflexion deters me from attempting in the narrow limits of a notice like this any criticism of Mr. Faussett's conclusions. I will only mention that some small details in this part of the work obviously need correction: thus on p. x. it is said that Cicero had in 66 B.C. combated the 'Attic style' of C. Licinius Calvus, although that orator was not more than sixteen years old at the time. It is, to say the least, very dubious whether the *pro Quinctio* and the *pro Roscio Amerino* are in the style of Hortensius. And is it recorded that more than one of the ancients professed to detect 'Patavinity' in Livy? The fourth section of the Introduction is 'on the occa-

sional colloquialism of Cicero's style'; and the whole ends with some very clear and useful genealogical and other tables. The fourth section seems to me to need thorough sifting and re-examination. The question with which it deals is very interesting, but vastly more difficult than the editor seems to conceive. No intelligible test of 'colloquialism' is propounded by him. In some passages (here and in the notes also) he uses 'archaism' and 'colloquialism' as convertible terms; and he seems to assume generally that if a usage is found in the Comic poets and in Cicero, and ceases with him, the usage may be deemed a 'colloquialism' in his writings. Surely this procedure is mistaken. There are at all times in every language phrases, forms and constructions which are on the point of vanishing from use; and it is only natural that some things should occur in Cicero for the last time. There are pretty definite indications that he sometimes clung to a usage after it had been abandoned by most men of his time; in such cases he may be charged with archaism but not with colloquialism. Instances probably are the gen. in -i of Greek names in 75 and the gen. sing. of the gerund with a plural substantive in the gen.—both treated as colloquial by Mr. Faussett. When we examine the separate items in the editor's list we have practical illustration of the slipperiness of the ground on which he here moves. *Postulo* is certainly used by Cicero with the Plautine sense 'expect' (though in the two instances quoted the meaning is 'demand'); but why should a sense be called colloquial in Cicero which often occurs in good writers after him, as well as before him? A great deal of the later Latin writing must be stamped as colloquial if that epithet is to apply to everything that happens to be in Plautus. As to *indignum facinus*, 'a monstrous thing,' the implication (here and in note on § 145) that it occurs only in Cicero and Plautus can hardly be maintained. There is no reason to suppose that *undique exclusus* in § 175 was suggested by the Plautine use of *exclusus*; but even if it were, this sense is so wide-spread in later poetry that it seems strange to call it colloquial. The ironical parenthetic *credo* surely pervades Latin from first to last. The statement, '*Adfinis* with dat. "a party to," § 127 note. Com. poets,' is not fortunate. In note on § 127 is quoted a line from *Trin.* 131 which happens to be the only place in Plautus where the word *adfinis* occurs with any other meaning than that of a connexion by marriage, whence some scholars have argued the line to be spurious. The metaphorical

sense is found once in Terence (*Haut.* 215), but with the gen. not the dat. I believe that in other pre-Ciceronian literature there are only two passages where *affinis* occurs at all: one in Accius with the ordinary sense, the other in Pacuvius, where the meaning is metaphorical but the construction (*ad* with gerund) is unique. After Cicero the metaphorical use vanishes. *Affinis* is a word with which, as with *amicus*, *vicinus*, *familiaris*, and others, it is natural to expect the dat. as well as the gen.; the latter with the substantival, the former with the adjectival use. If the whole of the MSS. evidence for *fortassis*, *amplexo*, *nostrorum* (= *nostri*), *nil quicquam* in Cicero be fairly considered with due regard to the probabilities, it will be found to be wanting. The evidence from MSS. for *ad-sentio* (which Quintilian positively states not to have been Latin), is stronger than that for *amplexo*. As to *senati*, an examination of Neue's citations would, I think, induce Mr. Faussett to remove it from his list. Again, why should the use by Cic. of legal phrases be deemed 'colloquial'? The statement that '*elogium*, *logus* and *dica* occur only in the Com. poets, the lawyers and Cic.' is incorrect. I think the only passage in which *elogium* occurs in comedy is *Mercator* 409; but it is found in Cato, the elder Seneca, Quintilian, Suetonius, and generally in late Latin, where it supplants *titulus* in some of its uses. It is very questionable whether *dica* occurs in the Roman legal writings; it was never used in Latin excepting in reference to the Greeks. What legal sense has *logus*? Where does it occur in Cic. outside of one fragment preserved by Nonius (where the reference is to jesting in the *ludi*)? From the Comic poets who use it Terence must be excluded; indeed outside Plautus it is found in comedy only in one fragment of Turpilus, but it does occur in later Latin. Perhaps the most surprising attribution of colloquialism in the whole list is to the use of participial adjectives in the comparative and superlative degree. Even Draeger's very imperfect lists of examples show the usage to be practically general in Latin literature. Exception might be taken to almost every other item in the editor's catalogue, but I must pass on to speak of the explanatory notes. The compass of the speech, and therefore of the notes, is so great that I can only select a few matters for comment.

§ 1. *altera . . . altera*: the neatness and lucidity of the opening sentence of the speech are entirely spoiled by taking these words as ablatives. The reason given that 'Latin generally prefers a personal to an

impersonal subject for a verb of action' is too weak to support the result, and is more than outweighed by a consideration of Cicero's inveterate tendency to personify *oratio*, *causa*, etc.: the extension of the personification to *pars causae* is natural and need cause no difficulty.

§ 3. *nemo est enim qui invidiae sine vestro ac sine talium virorum subsidio possit resistere*. To take *talium v.* as explanatory of *vestri* is surely forbidden by the marked separation which the words *ac sine* produce. No doubt Cicero was thinking of the new jury-courts, as in § 95 *sine vestra sapientia ac sine iudiciorum remediis*. It is quite possible that the latter passage caused the insertion of *ac sine* in § 3, or that *sine* was accidentally written twice over and the *ac* inserted because a copula was felt to be needed. It is of course easy to parallel *vestro talium*.

§ 6. *Att.* 1, 17, 11 does not supply an example of pres. subj. second person in a command addressed to a definite person, for *cures* is in the apodosis of a conditional sentence.

§ 9. *Praejudicium* = 'prejudice' is not merely 'post-classical'; it is not Latin at all.

§ 10. The assumed distinction between *ni* and *nisi* breaks down on being tested by MSS. evidence all through Cicero's works. It is very doubtful whether he ever used *ni* excepting in connexion with the *sponsio* and other technical forms. *Nisi* was often written *n* in MSS. and naturally got to be sometimes copied as *ni*.

§ 11. It is hard to believe that Cic. intended *petam longius exordium* to mean 'I shall look out for an unusually long prelude.' Mr. Faussett's own rendering, 'shall carry you some way back for the commencement of my proof,' seems to require *longius* to be an adverb; and in a note on § 58 he certainly appears to indicate that it is so.

§ 12. If all the instances of *coniungi* with abl. given by Ciceronian MSS. be carefully examined, the evidence for the construction will be seen to be far from strong, and it is assuredly not easy to explain.

§ 18. *Instituere exercitum* is rather to organise a force than merely to drill it (which is *exercere*): cf. Caes. *B.G.* 6, 34, 6—*instituta ratio exercitus Romani*, 'the established organisation of the Roman army.' In passages like this, where the figure called *distributio* is employed, it is not necessary to draw nice distinctions between the verbs; two of those used here, *instruere* and *instituere*, are in many of their usages convertible.

§ 22. It should have been noted that the

temporal abl. denoting a space of time *before* the given date is of great rarity.

§ 24. The distinction between *usus* and *experientia* (which must not be pressed too far) may be illustrated by Lucr. 5, 1452—*usus et impigrae simul experientia mentis*.

§ 27. The employment of *admirari* (like *admiratio*) of unpleasant surprise is not rightly described as rare.

§ 28. The note on *quisquam* is incomplete; there are instances in Cicero where the implication of *quisquam* is certainly positive.

§ 30. *ad hanc mortem*: here *ad* means 'on the occurrence of' (a frequent sense, especially in Cic.), not 'in addition to,' which (apart from being in itself unsuitable to the sentence) would require a verb.

§ 37. *horti*: not exactly 'pleasure-ground,' but a country (or more commonly suburban) house and grounds.

§ 41. The proper title for the municipal magistrates is *duoviri* not *duumviri*.

§ 45. The note on *animum inducere* needs more precision. The sense is always *statuere*; the *ut*-construction is found only twice in Cic.; the acc. and inf. is perhaps confined in Cic. to one passage and in Livy to two or three; there is also the odd construction with acc. alone in *Att.* 7, 3, 8.

§ 53. note on *venio*. For 'neuter subject' 'neuter pronoun as subject' should be read.

§ 66. It is very unlikely that Cic. applied *cupidus* (elsewhere common in the sense of 'biassed') here for once to a *iudex* with the meaning 'greedy.'

§ 67. I do not understand the statement that *iam* at the beginning of the paragraph here and in § 46, 47 introduces a *general* truth. The use of *iam* has no necessary connexion with the nature of the statement that follows it.

§ 74. 'some magistrates, e.g. the consuls, had both *lictiores* and *viatores*' is vague and misleading; the possession of *lictiores* was of course bound up with the possession of the *fascēs*.

§ 77. The assertion that *vir* refers to public character, *homo* to private, cannot be sustained. The point of the jest in the well-known passage of *Qu. Fr.* 2, 11, 5 *virum te putabo si Sallusti Empedoclea legeris, hominem non putabo* is missed. The meaning is 'I shall deem you heroic if you get through the *Empedoclea* of Sallustius; human I shall not deem you.' See my note on *Arch.* § 16.

§ 81. *ne eripi quidem pecunia*: the editor is, I believe, wrong in making *quidem* qualify *eripi* only and not the whole phrase *eripi pecunia*. It is true that *quidem* does as a rule refer to the word it follows, but there

are exceptions; and in particular the tendency to place only *one* word between *ne* and *quidem* is so great that sometimes compound phrases to which *ne... quidem* refers are intersected by the *quidem*.

§ 88. The rule laid down about the use of a 'descriptive' adjective (why this limitation?) between a demonstrative and its substantive vanishes from view on inquiry, buried beneath the exceptions.

§ 90. The note on the *provocatio* of Iunius lacks clearness.

§ 95. Can it be truly said that any subjunctive *depends* on *nedum*?

§ 97. Munro on Lucr. 6, 1232 ignores the possibility of *morti* in *m. damnatus* being abl.; the reasons of Schmalz in the new edition of the *Antibarbarus* (s.v. *damnare*) are strong against it, and are capable of being reinforced.

§ 99. The note on the use of the local abl. greatly lacks precision.

§ 101. It would be well to restrict *anaphora* to its ancient use, of single words recurring at the beginning of parallel clauses. The extended use of the word in modern grammatical writings, where it covers almost any parallelism in the structure of clauses, often produces vagueness and confusion.

§ 103. The statement about the Latin cases should be confined to the spoken Latin of the vulgar.

§ 118. One of the jests of Cato here quoted from Gellius should have been given from *De Or.* 2, 260, whence Gellius probably took it.

§ 119. The doctrine that *infamia* was the result of a *turpe iudicium*, *ignominia* of the *scriptio* of the censor, is very far from being correct.

§ 126. The mere order of the censor '*equum vendere*' cannot have been in itself equivalent to making a man an *aerarius*; its effect would only be to remove him from the number of the *equites equo publico*, or possibly from the *equites* altogether. Probably when the censors disgraced a man by issuing this order they commonly went farther and made him an *aerarius*, but some additional pronouncement would be needed for that end.

§ 135. There can hardly be any practical doubt that *elogium* was borrowed from Greek; its structure cannot be explained from Latin. The quantity of the *e* in the earlier Latin is doubtful.

Id. Is it likely that Cic. would use *censoria scriptio* in a metaphorical sense after employing the phrase in its ordinary sense three times in the sections immediately preceding, to say nothing of the frequent

occurrence of equivalent phrases in this part of the speech? The difficulty of taking *subscriptio* as a causal abl. is not so great as the editor thinks, owing to the incompleteness of Draeger's list, to which add *Div. in Caec.* 8; *Fin.* 2, 83 and 3, 34; *Brut.* 308: there are other examples which I have not at hand. The distinction between the 'internal' and the 'external' cause is moreover often hard to apply: see e.g. *Att.* 1, 1, 4 *familiaritate*.

§ 147. Mr. Faussett's note on *quasi mente quadam legis* is not quite clear to me; but the interpretation I give to the words—'by the intellectual force, if I may so call it, of the law'—is, I think, intended to be rejected by him. Just because *mens legis* was a strong and unusual expression Cic. apologises for it by *quasi quadam*: see my note on *Acad.* 1, 21. The identification of law with intellect or reason was very familiar to the Romans.

§ 148. The note on *mortales* should be more exact. Cicero's usage is differentiated from Sallust's not by the distinction between sing. and plur. (as might be inferred from the note), but by the necessity in Cic. of conjoining some word with *mortalis* such as *omnes*, *multi*, *nemo*.

§ 162. The note on the Roman notation will mislead some readers into supposing that the Romans had no method for making the difference between tens, hundreds and thousands (when expressed by numeral signs) visible to the eye; such methods were of course the bar above the numeral and the three sides of the square about it.

§ 178. *Optare* is not 'to set one's heart on a thing,' but to desire something which one can only obtain by great good fortune.

§ 189. A ἀπαξ εἰρημένον like *scelerum adfluentem* should be narrowly scanned and only accepted on the most cogent grounds. The reference to *refertus*, which is used freely both with gen. and abl., is useless. To me it seems more probable that the two MSS. known as S and T (Classen's A and B) have altered the terminations of the two words *scelerum omnium*, owing to the influence of *perpetuum* which immediately precedes, than that Cic. should for once desert a common usage of this class.

There are a good many points in the notes on the subject-matter about which I should have liked to say something had space permitted. These notes are on the whole careful and good, but they might be much improved by revision in the light of ancient authorities. The problems presented by the text of the *pro Cluentio* are often of great interest, but I cannot touch on them here. Mr. Faussett's edition is nowhere more in advance of Ramsay's than in the construction of the text. I hope that in a new edition some compression will be found possible, in order to provide room for notes on a considerable number of difficulties or important facts which are not noticed. It should be observed that Mr. Faussett has been fortunate in obtaining assistance from Prof. Nettleship and Mr. Roby.

J. S. REID.

DOWDALL'S LIVY, BOOK XXII.

Livy, Book XXII. Edited with Introduction, Notes and Maps, by the REV. LAUNCELOT DOWDALL, M.A., Late Scholar, First Senior Moderator and University Student, Trinity College, Dublin; B.D. Christ Church, Oxford. 3s. 6d.

This is not a school-book, the editor's object being 'to supply the needs of advanced students, especially at the Universities, by providing them with a correct text of Livy and an ample commentary, dealing with textual difficulties and questions of grammar, geography, and history as they arise.' This object Mr. Dowdall appears to have successfully attained. He gives Madvig's text, not indeed that of Madvig's latest edition (1886), but that of the third

edition (1880). The distinction however, is of little moment, for though there are quite twenty passages in which Madvig's two editions differ, yet two-thirds of the changes affect only single words, and most of the others are comparatively unimportant. Mr. Dowdall also reserves to himself the right of private judgment where Madvig's conjectures appear to him 'too rash or improbable.'

In ch. 2, § 3, *et omne veterani robur exercitus*; in 20, 11, *fuere*; and in 53, 5 and 12. *L. Caecilium Metellum* and *L. Caecilii* are in agreement with Madvig's latest edition.¹ In

¹ In the edition of 1880 Madvig read *id omne veterani robur exercitus*; *fuere*; *M. Caecilium Metellum* and *M. Caecilii*. In the last two cases the intended reading was given in the *corrigenda*, and *L.* appeared in the text.

38, 9, Madvig now reads '*mirari se, quidni, qui dux priusquam aut suum aut hostium exercitum . . . &c. nosset, iam nunc togatus in urbe sciret, quae sibi agenda armato forent, diem quoque praedicere posset, qua cum hoste signis collatis esset dimicaturus*;' the change being the substitution of '*quidni*' for the unintelligible '*quodne*,' and the omission of *et* before *diem*; the gain in point of sarcasm being great. The change is worth Mr. Dowdall's consideration.

I have noticed no misprints in the text, but the marginal numbering of § 10 has been omitted in ch. 18. In the notes one would be glad to think that the statement on p. 85, col. 2, ' $40 - 25 = 15 - 4 = 11$ ' was a printer's error. The proposition as it stands is certainly not in accordance with fact; but it appears to be used as a compendious form of the following: $40 - 25 = 15$, and $15 - 4 = 11$. Altogether there is throughout the notes a certain recklessness in the use of mathematical formulae. Thus on p. 149, col. 2, appears the following, '*fugisset*, subj. because it = reason assigned by ambassadors for his surrender.' Why '='? 'Is' would do just as well, and 'gives' much better. This is only one instance among several. Rather worse is the abuse of the formula of proportion. On p. 47, col. 1 we find '*iussitur: iusso :: faxitur: favo*,' and on p. 136, col. 2, '*antiquo: antiquus :: veto: vetus*.' Why not keep these symbols to their proper place, treatises on mathematics?

On p. 57, col. 1 (note on *Beneventanum*, 13, 1), it is strangely said that '*Beneventum* . . . was originally called *Maleventum* from its unhealthiness.' It is true that the Romans objected to *Maleventum* as a word apparently ominous and so changed the *male* to *bene*, but *Maleventum* was no real compound of *male*. Surely the true derivation is from *Malóeus* (compare *Tarentum*, *Agri-gentum*). This however must be a slip, which with the blemishes mentioned above will not detract materially from the solid value of the notes. They are on the whole clear, while they are full of learning, with copious references to authorities and parallel passages.

The topographical notes are good, but the inference contained in p. 197 (note on *flumini propius*, 45, 6) is hardly sound: 'though it is not distinctly stated on which side of the Aufidus the battle was fought, yet as the Romans faced south and had their right on the river, it seems evident that it took place on the left or north bank.' Mr. Strachan-Davidson (*Selections from Polybius*, Proleg. iv. and App. iii.) has

proved — conclusively, I think — that the battle of Cannae was fought on the right or S.E. side of the river (of which the general course is from S.W. to N.E.), though probably at some little distance from it. Livy, as Mr. Strachan-Davidson points out, ought to have stated, as Polybius does (iii. 111, end), that Hannibal on the arrival of the consuls moved from his original camp near the village of Cannae, crossed the Aufidus and encamped in a new position on the N.W. side of the river. That Livy was not aware of this is clear from 43, 11, and yet his account of the battle is unintelligible without supposing Hannibal to have changed his camp. For if the battle was fought on the N.W. side of the river, you cannot get the river on the right of the Romans as they face south, unless you put them in a loop of the river, which we have no authority for doing. Livy makes the Romans face south with their right on the river, and yet implies that the battle was fought on the side remote from Cannae. His account therefore is not consistent as it stands.

I doubt the translation of *foede* in 3, 1, and 6, 9. It seems to me that as a rule Livy uses *foedus* to suggest horror rather than disgrace.

On p. 24, col. 2 (note on 5, 4), Mr. Dowdall supports the manuscript reading '*ad gemitus vulnerum*,' which he translates 'at the groans of the wounded,' adding '*vulnerum* = objective genitive, i.e. groans arising from wounds: for *vulnera* = *vulnerati* cf. 21, 29, 3.' In 21, 29, 3 *vulnera* is not equivalent to *vulnerati*, and if *vulnerum* is equivalent to *vulneratorum* here, it is not an objective genitive.

On p. 37, col. 1, where it is observed that 'after the battle of Cannae we find two dictators existing together 23, 22, 11,' it should be added that only one was *rei gerundae causa*.

The note on *Punicum* . . . os, 13, 6, is interesting. In the summary of the chapter 'through an error of pronunciation' should be 'through a misunderstanding.'

On p. 96, in the notes on 22, 20, *haud frustra* is rendered 'not without reason' or 'not without good results.' I think the editor hardly appreciates the logical force of the sentence, which I take to mean: 'and it was thought that a sensible man like Abelux must have had good reason for changing sides.' 'Et' introduces a second explanation of the credit gained for the Romans by Abelux' perfidy. Thus 'not without good results' is an impossible rendering.

On p. 154, col. 1, the note on *patrum* (34, 1) is so condensed that it would probably be misleading to any one who did not already understand the history of the subject. It ought, at least, to be pointed out that Livy is here using the terms *patrum* and *plebis* in an untechnical sense, and also that the terms are perhaps slightly justified by the fact that the patricians were still more or less jealous of plebeians as such. This was shown by their manœuvres to prevent two plebeians from holding the consulate (Livy, 23, 31, 13).

On p. 197, in the note on *pedites*, Mr. Dowdall says 'it is remarkable that Varro posted the Roman infantry, *in which he was so much superior to Hannibal*, in column rather than in line.' (The italics are mine). The truth is that the superiority in all but numbers was quite the other way.

Hannibal's heavy infantry were chiefly Hamilcar's veterans, splendid soldiers who had lately adopted the arms of Roman legionaries. The greater part of the Roman infantry were recruits. This explains Varro's crushing defeat, and, if we forget this, not even the vast superiority of the general and the cavalry on the Carthaginian side will make the defeat intelligible.

The student of Livy will find in the notes almost all that he can want to know presented to him in a very unpretentious form.

The Introduction deals with Livy's authorities for the Second Punic War, and there is a good map of Southern Italy, with another of Corsica and Sardinia set in the corner of the sheet. The paper and printing are excellent.

M. T. TATHAM.

SOUNDS AND INFLECTIONS IN GREEK AND LATIN.

Sounds and Inflections in Greek and Latin, by J. E. KING and C. COOKSON: Clarendon Press, 1888. (488 pages, with indices.) 18s.

EVERY one must have noticed how thoroughly, if rather tardily, our scholarship has acknowledged within these two or three years the importance of the revolution accomplished by the German *Neugrammatiker* of the last decade. It is no longer held safe to swear by Curtius: perhaps indeed his work is getting too much ignored. The absolute rigidity of phonetic law and the far-reaching effects of analogy are practically, if not theoretically, allowed on all hands, and hecatombs of cherished etymologies are unwillingly offered on the altar of a reconstituted science. But though America has held her own in the propaganda, England has till now produced no adequate expositions of the new views, and our authors have, if for this reason only, earned the gratitude of all students who are not prepared to consult the German originals. They set forth with lucidity and comprehensiveness the doctrines of the leaders of their science, and their shortcomings are mainly due to the difficulties besetting all compilations which attempt to bring together the opinions of men who work on different lines. I shall endeavour to point out the most striking of these faults, not with the idea of condemning the book, but rather of suggesting improvements for the second edition.

The first criticism that suggests itself is that from the point of view of the ordinary student, such as the candidate for the First Part of the Classical Tripos at Cambridge, the book is written on rather too generous a scale. It is too big, too detailed, and scarcely within the reach of any who do not mean to make linguistic science a special study. For them a primer is still called for, to supply only the broad principles and the general results. We must judge the present work as meant for embryo specialists. In such a book, starting from so uncompromising a statement of phonetic invariability (p. 14), it is above all essential that every formal equation and etymology given should be referred to its rules or else definitely explained: at the very least an irregularity should be acknowledged, otherwise beginners stumble hopelessly, and advanced readers detect the old Adam of 'sporadic change.' Unfortunately our authors admit this objection almost everywhere. It seems largely due to a too implicit reliance on that very risky book, G. Meyer's *Greek Grammar*, of which by the by they only use the first edition: the edition of 1886 often differs amusingly. The most serious of many points in which he has misled them relates to the treatment of the sonant liquids in Greek. We are told that they often passed into *up pu*, *op po*, *vp pv* etc. (Meyer² § 27—30), while no attempt at a rule is given, nor is the difficulty clearly recognised. One can hardly speak too strongly

of such antinomian practice joined to so rigid an orthodoxy of sentiment. What is a learner to think when our authors tell him on p. 91 that τ = Gk. *ap pa*, and on p. 75 that $\iota\phi$ in *κίρνημι* represents a liquid sonant; on p. 115 that \tilde{r} = *op pa*, while on p. 306 I. E. $\eta\tilde{r}di$ = $\mu\tilde{r}a$? No *αὐτὸς ἔφα* could justify such inconsistencies, and Meyer is no Brugmann, useful and (on occasion) strict though his work may be. It is a great misfortune that Messrs. King and Cookson could not use Brugmann's *Grundriss*. If their second edition is checked throughout by the principles laid down in that epoch-making book, its value as an introduction to the science will be immeasurably enhanced. One further suggestion may be made before proceeding to a detailed criticism. Cannot footnotes be added giving references to the original source of each statement, like those which are given in the Grammars of J. Müller's *Handbuch*? It need not take much room, and the gain would be very great.

The introductory chapters, on the history of linguistic science and on the classification of the dialects, are in general admirably concise and clear. Conciseness indeed goes rather too far in the account of the Greek dialects. Thus it is really misleading to select the retention of the \tilde{a} as the 'most prominent characteristic of Doric,' unless Doric is defined as everything outside the Ionic-Attic group. And whatever explanation be given to the *πλατειασμός* of Theocr. 15, 88, it surely cannot have been the broad vowel which was the very opposite of a peculiarity? The classification of the I. E. family would be improved by reckoning only eight divisions: the Indian and Iranian, the Baltic and Slavonic, are as little to be separated as Latin and Oscan, Ionic and Aeolic. Ch. iii., on phonetics and alphabets, leaves little to be desired. The main faults of the book come in with the detailed treatment of phonology. '*καπνός* = *vapor*' (p. 61) deserves its query, which is equally required by '*uter* = *πόρεος*' etc. (p. 362). On p. 62 comes the first example of 'metathesis,' a vicious principle which reappears throughout: cf. pp. 104, 125, 217 (*bis*), in spite of the disclaimer on p. 200. Moreover the statement that '*ἀρπάζω* shows metathesis, I. E. $\sqrt{\text{arp}}$,' makes a worse confusion. *Πτερόν* for *περὸν* (p. 65) needs explaining: why not rather Skt. *pātatra*, i.e. $\sqrt{\text{perpōn}}$, with dissimilation and weak root? *morior* (p. 68) should not be given to illustrate original *o*: the note on *mortis*, p. 105, ignores Skt. *mṛti*- and *mṛiyāte*. *βόθρος* = *fodō* (*ib.*) shows an unexplained β : see Brugmann, *Grd.*

i. § 319. The list for '*o* to *u*,' p. 73, includes many where the reverse really happened—*θύρα φύω* are hardly younger than *fores fore*. The note on *ἵππος* (p. 75) does not relieve the difficulty, and that on *πίτνημι κίρνημι* etc. only explains one unknown by calling up another. The explanation of these ι forms seems to me very simple. *σκίδνημι* = *scindo*, *caedo*, came from $\sqrt{\text{sqhait}}$ (*d*); *σκεδάω* Skt. *skhad* from the wholly distinct, but nearly synonymous *sqhed*. The proportion *σκεδάω*: *σκίδνημι*, made *πελάω*: *πιδναμαι*, *πετάννημι*: *πίτνημι* etc. On p. 91 we can hardly help inferring that *καρδία* and Skt. *hṛd* are cognates. Those who still think so might at least explain the genesis of the 'unoriginal' Skt. *h* (see p. 132). The treatment of *ἔχρος* (p. 93) is extremely confusing. To begin with we have the generally repudiated 'aspiration before nasals,' and then the equation '*ἔχρος* = $\sqrt{i(h)mago}$ ' comes without a hint that it is an *alternative*. The following '*ῥῖγος* or *σῖγος* = *frigus*' suggests that a Latin *fr* = *yr* is regarded as conceivable. Surely that ghost is laid? The plausible connexion '*Στρυμὼν* $\sqrt{\text{srey}}$ ' (p. 94) can only be allowed if the name is not Greek. The difficult intervocalic σ in *πράσων* (p. 104) ought not to have been ignored. P. 108 gives two examples of a method far too common—the setting a word between two mutually exclusive but equally fascinating etymologies, and leaving it there in the position of the proverbial donkey. If *ἔπαθον* answers to *πέπονθα* it cannot dally with *patior*; and if *παχός* = *bahú* it cannot be given over to *pinguis*, for Grassmann's Law requires an initial spirant (cf. *of-FenD-ix* $\sqrt{\text{bhendh}}$ etc.). The comparison of *ὀνόματα* and *cognomenta* (p. 110) ought to be guarded for beginners by a reference to p. 212. The theory of dissyllabic roots, endorsed by Hübschmann, might certainly claim a right to elucidate p. 115. The equations on p. 124 would do very well without '*obscurus* and *σκία*'—what about Skt. *chāyā*? The comparison '*κῆρας* = *κόνις* = *cinis*' involves very serious irregularities, implying clearly that the Skt. lingual may be treated like a dental. The same laxity is traceable in ' $\sqrt{\text{kas}}$ *κάστωρ*,' two pages before, in '*ganda* = *γνάθος*' (p. 135), and in '*jathara* = *gñt-ter*' (p. 141). On p. 130 we are told that *ἔ-τε-τη-ον* is parallel to *πότμος*: it ought then to be carefully distinguished from *ἔ-τε-τη-ον* (p. 158) like *ἐ-νε-γκ-έν*. '*κλόνις* for *κλοφνις*' (p. 132) has been sufficiently pulverised by Brugmann (M. U. iii. 20 n.). To explain the β of *βίος* by comparing *βανά* (p. 135) is odd, since the difficulty lies in the labial for a velar

before *ι*. The connexion of *δίδυμος* and *δίναμαι* with *√ gen* (p. 138) is about as bad as could be conceived—a palatal *g* becoming *δ*, and *η* appearing as *υ*! Why is Osthoff's *durus* rejected? *tricae* should not be mentioned with *torquere* (p. 139) unless some explanation is forthcoming. As to I. E. *√ gheugh* (p. 143), it must obviously make **jugh* or *juh* in Skt., while the participle *gūdhā* proves a final palatal: the *√* should thus be *gheugh*, excluding *κέυθω*. But Fierlinger's *Ω-γγ-ία* makes *geugh(h)* more likely. Notice that on p. 208 '*custos*, *√ kēndh*, *κέυθω*' are given without any note of inconsistency. Mr. Bury's ingenious comparison of *παρθένος* and *virgo* (p. 145) fails because Grassmann's Law would bring **for(g)u-o* out of I. E. *ghrgh*. *ποδαπός* (p. 146) has I. E. termination *-ḡo-* (Lat. *-inguos*), not *-go*. What is the meaning of '*ἴδωρ* for *σφεδωρ*' (p. 148) and '*ἵραξ* for *σφεραξ*' (p. 170: there is a wrong reference on p. 184)? cf. also pp. 190 (*ἵλη*), 204 (*ἵπνος*), 214 (*ἵνις*). Are these Greek changes or ablaut? Just below comes '*διδάσκω* for *δι-δκ-σκω* (?)': this very questionable statement is required only by the admission of *decet*. In the *δ* scale all is then orderly: ablaut ii. *δοκέω*, *doceo* (causal), iii. **διδάκ-σκω* (*dōk*), iv. *disco(-dōk)*. Contrast p. 250, where the frank confession of ignorance on a hard point of vocalism not yet cleared up is a great improvement on the rash statements too often made in this book without any reservation. On p. 156 we cannot allow the identity *φάος* (*φάφος*) and *fax*, and the account of *γλυκίς* seems to state that *δεῖκος* proves a *√ dleuk* and admits *dulcis*. On *νός* a reference might be made to Osthoff's account (M.U. iv. 185 note) since it explains the declension of *νός*. The account of intervocalic *s* in Latin gives not a hint of the great number of exceptions: next edition will doubtless contain some reference to Mr. Conway's theory. It would be interesting to know on what authority it is stated (p. 166), that Alcaeus and Sappho replaced the no longer living *F* by *β*. How is '*φαίνεται μοι κῆνος βίσιος θεοῖσι*' scanned? *φάστν* and *φαστία* should not have been connected (p. 160) without a note on the vocalism. The *δ-* in *ὄπατρος ὄζυξ* (p. 172) cannot be for *ση-*, whatever it is. On p. 187 we cannot consistently accept the statement that '*ovis* was used for the sake of clearness for the more correct **avis*' (= *ὄφης*). Phonetic change being unconscious, we cannot check it by any such considerations. At least so runs a cardinal theorem of the school whose exponents our authors profess to be. The fact that both *ovis* and *bos* contravene Latin

phonetics is a strong argument for the theory, at first sight so strange, that they came originally from the dialects: the coincidence may conceivably throw some light upon primitive Roman life. The account of *gravis*, closely following, does not settle the point. The proportion *gmjō : venio :: grus : *vorvis* is not exact—the last should clearly be **vorvus* if the parallel will hold at all. The *-is* is always considered a further suffix, and 'metathesis' is a very dangerous tool. For a safer explanation see Brugmann's *Grundriss* i. § 290 n., ii. § 103. On p. 194 we have the equation *κισσός* (i.e. *κισθ-ός*) = *hedera*: the *ι* should have been noticed—why not **κεσσός* like *μέσσοσ*, and moreover is the *σσ* Attic? Is '*βυσσός* beside *βαθύς*' (ib.) another case of that strange intruder '*υ* for *η*'? Why is the change *sr* to *fr* 'doubtful' (p. 212)? The medial *-br-* is just what establishes it, and cases of initial *r* alone go back to the I. E. doublet in which the *s* has vanished. *pressi* from *perdh-si* (p. 217) is another case of unlicensed 'metathesis.' How are we to explain the genesis of '*κόλινος*' (p. 219, cf. 301)? *o + ī* is as much a hiatus as *ou* would be. The spelling *coelum coeruleus* (p. 220) is carelessly allowed. On p. 228 the Skt. *bheuj* is equated to I. E. *bheugh*, but this would become **buh*: it should be *bheugh(h)*, i.e. a doublet (Brugmann's *Grundriss* i. § 469-8). The theory of *āyo* (p. 232 sq.) is very important, and one cannot help feeling that Hübschmann's view of its vocalism has not been accepted because imperfectly apprehended. At any rate the summary on p. 233 thoroughly misrepresents him. What he really says is (1) that from a root *āj* in the *ā* scale the aorist-present, in Skt. must be **ijāti*, (2) that consequently we must allow an *ā* scale, in which the imperf. present is *ājō* and the aorist-present *ājō*, Skt. *ājāmi* and **ajāmi*. Brugmann (*Grundriss* i. § 318) accepts Hübschmann's position, which is really unassailable: it is curious to note that on p. 246 our authors assume it without question. In the ablaut list, p. 245, *θείνω* ought to have been given between *φόνος* and *πέφαται*, if only to emphasise the fact so constantly ignored, that *θείνω* *ἐπεφνον* etc. belong together as much as *κτείνω* and *ἐκτανον*. The lists of doubtful cases which close the description of ablaut are misleading through their including so much that can be easily explained as the notes suggest. The cases left are few, and only mean that we have still probably a few subsidiary rules to graft upon our theory of vocalism.

So closes the phonology, except the chapter on Accent, and our complaints become

fewer. We note one or two serious omissions. No mention is made of I. E. voiceless aspirates *kh, qh* etc.: their existence is at any rate allowed now, though no rules for them can be said to come under the *quod ab omnibus*. Nor is there any reference to the very important I. E. consonant changes summarised in Brugmann's *Grundriss* i. § 469. That the treatment of accent is imperfect is the authors' misfortune rather than their fault, since their chief authority, Wheeler, was as yet unscathed by Bloomfield. The latter's recent criticism (*A.J.P.* ix. 1 *sqq.*) must considerably affect any future treatment of the subject. Coming to details, there is some carelessness in the statement of Verner's Law which will probably puzzle a learner. On p. 260 we are told that 'when the root is accented in Sanskrit, in German we have surd fricatives in the corresponding conjugation.' Two pages later we find that in these verbs 'the Indian termination *t* corresponds to a German *d*.' The fault is that no provision is made in the rule for cases where the explosive falls between two unaccented vowels. On p. 269 *ei* is called a late form by comparison with *eis* and *esai*. But *esai* is indisputably the I. E. form, and how can *ei* have arisen except from this? A misprint occurs on p. 271—*pādam* for the gen. plur. Is the accent of *παρδάρι* so certainly wrong (p. 278) when we have *pitṛsu*? ἀμφί and ἀβή, on the next page, cannot be equated exactly: the *am* must be either *ām* or *hā*. Presently we have *ἰθαρός* compared with Skt. *vidhrá*, while on two other occasions (pp. 93 and 246) it shows us the weak root of *aiθw*.

Passing to the chapter on Nouns, the I. E. type '*ieug-s*' (p. 291) ought to have been written *yeug-s*. Two misprints strike us: '*rékós*' (p. 294), and '*aiys*' for *aius* (p. 298). Between these is a doubtful statement as to Lat. *Dis*, for *D(ue)s* (*sic*)—this ignores the *i* that precedes the *y*. It should have been **Diy-s*, by analogy of the genitive *dinós*. The scheme of the strong flexion on p. 299 is very doubtful. In view of the clear evidence for a movable locative suffix can we prefer *παρπί* to *pitári*? It would perhaps be more satisfactory to suppose that the two I. E. types *dótor-* and *detér* differed by sentence accent. On p. 304 *über* (= **oúbar*) would perhaps be referred better to an I. E. *oudhē*, like *vēow*. The statement that '*úsas* (*sic*) was still neuter in Sanskrit' (p. 308) finds no encouragement in Grassmann or Whitney. A much better explanation of *deōr* is suggested by Schmidt (K.Z. xxvi. 401 *sqq.*), viz. that it is due to the old plural of *dékos*, whose *-ōs* is proved by Skt.

vacāms(i), Zd. *vacā*. Thus *φάος*: *φῶος*, *frigus*: *rigōr* (whose initial *s* has been dropped), are simply singular: plural. This would improve the declension on p. 351. The note on p. 312 would have been better left out—how can *majoRem* be parallel to *formoSus*? χαμαί is given as a locative (p. 316) and as a dative (preferably) five pages later. The adverbs in *-εί* ought not to have been mentioned without a note on the type *δοτακτί* (p. 318). In dealing with the genitive it would have been well to mention the suffix *s* (the weakened form of *es, os*), which appears so prominently in Indo-Iranian. '*Bhuvās*' (for *-ās*) has escaped the corrector on p. 325. The equation βασιλειεφος = βασιλῆος (p. 327) neglects the Greek contraction rule. Brugmann (*Grundriss* ii. p. 300) still gives up these difficult stems. It is surely very unnecessary to query the strong flexion of the nominative plural (p. 329)? The accusative was weak, but Skt. *mātṛs*, with its hysterogenous *ṛ*, is not much proof. Γοργώ, voc. Γοργόι, is not a nasal stem (p. 335), but is parallel to Skt. *senā* voc. *senē* (see K.Z. xxvii. 369 *sqq.*). 'Skt. *arvās*' (plur.) has been left on p. 336. The flexion of primitive Italic *o-* nouns (p. 343) is certainly 'insecure.' Considering that contraction of vowels was complete in the I. E., 'Italic' forms like *equo-es*, *equo-om* etc. would puzzle us, even if we could understand what the 'loc. *equo-sue*' stood upon. On p. 347 *dīēum* = **Zēva* is hardly right—it should rather be **Zḡfa*. Among the numerals, the very serious difficulties of 6 are shirked; while *ἕκτος* receives slovenly treatment. How can '*sextus*, Anglo-Saxon *sixta*' prove 'an original σφεκτος?'

The Verb is on the whole well handled, though in a subject so difficult criticism is bound to find a good many disputable points. Hesitation on the question of the old school **phéromi* should surely not be shown by writers professing so strict a creed: p. 441 gives the case for I. E. *thérō* with admirable decisiveness, but on p. 376 Curtius holds the large print, while 'another explanation' in small type proves to be that which relegated **dharami* to the limbo of curious antiquities. The simplest interpretation of *είεν* (p. 380) seems to be that **eiher* was formed like *ειήμεν*, by levelling, whence came *είεν(τ)* by regular shortening. *ώφίγγοντο* (p. 387) is best explained as a compound verb, **ώ φίγγνμι* (*ώ* = Skt. *ā*, cf. *ώκεανός*, *ώφελέω* etc.): the Lesbian *όφείγγν* gives us another conjugation. The Greek aorists in *-θην* have at last received a really satisfactory explanation from Wackernagel, in the last number of Kuhn (K.Z. xxx.

302), and in the same issue (p. 224 *sqq.*) there is an admirable investigation of the 'passive' τ by Zimmer: both these may well be substituted in the next edition for the views of Brugmann here given. The reduplicated verbs (p. 398) should be divided into nonthematic and thematic, both original classes. 'Skt. *ācinavam*' (p. 401) is imaginary, possibly due to confusion with *ācinavam*. On p. 403 a misprint twice repeated makes the Skt. 9th class form plural in *-nī-*. The note on *av*, *avos* etc. (p. 466n.) gives De Saussure's theory without any reference to its complete refutation by Osthoff and Hübschmann, whose views are taken elsewhere. Monro's explanation of the 1st aorist *a* is certainly not 'simpler than that of Brugmann,' since the latter treating *ἔδειξα*, *ἔδειξαμεν* and *ἔδειξαν* as original makes the extension of the *a* just three times as easy as in a theory which gets all from one form *ἔδειξα*. The treatment of the Imperative is seriously weakened by the small weight given to Thurneysen's extremely acute paper upon the subject (K.Z. xxvii. 172), full of suggestions reaching considerably beyond the immediate point. Brugmann has adopted his account of the suffix *-tōd*, as our authors might have seen in the *Greek Grammar* (p. 91). The printer is evidently responsible for the curious slip which gives Skt. *īhi* as a 'pure verb theme without personal suffix' (p. 434). *vis* (from *volo*) is left as obscure (p. 449), though the identity with Skt. *vēxi* (cf. *ἔπει*) is given by Stolz. '*Bhāva*,' on the next page, is an awkward misprint, as *bhāvati* actually has aorists of that form. Following this, the thematic class

with *nō*, *nē* answers to the unthematic *nā* verbs, not the *ney*. The treatment of the Italic and Celtic *b* forms (p. 469) is rather over-sceptical. Thurneysen's article (B.B. viii. 269 *sqq.*) is suggestive here. The same paper presents a very strong case for the identity *ferētis* = *φέρητε*, which would elucidate the problems of p. 470. On p. 473 the mention of *datūrus* suggests that the denominatives *parturio esurio* from agent nouns ('desideratives') are left unexplained. It might have been added, moreover, that the 'strong stem has penetrated to' the Latin *-tus* participle through the influence of the so-called supine. Two very useful summaries close the book as appendices. P. 480 shows a misprint in Skt. '*evan*' for *çvan*. The sigmatic aorist should not have been given to ablaut ii. (p. 485) without a reference to the '*vyddhi*' forms: see Brugmann, *Grundriss*, i. § 314.

Here I may close what will not, I hope, be mistaken for a hostile criticism. Only a strong appreciation of the invaluable service Messrs. King and Cookson have rendered to English scholarship would make it worth while to catalogue these details. My criticisms are from a practical point of view, suggested by the wants of students who have used the book. So while conscious that some of them may be wrong or too exacting, I offer them in the hope that they may be of service in perfecting a work which must greatly advance the scientific study of the classical languages in this country.

J. H. MOULTON.

THE ARCADO-CYPRIAN DIALECT.

The Arcado-Cyprian Dialect. By HERBERT WEIR SMYTH, Ph.D. Transactions American Philological Association, 1887. Vol. xviii.

THE author of the above article having previously made (*American Journal of Philology*, vol. vii. p. 421 *ff.*) an examination of the inter-relations of the dialects of Thessaly, Boeotia, Lesbos, and Elis, in which he endeavoured to establish the connection of these with the North Greek of Phocis and Locris, undertakes in the present paper an examination of the Arcadian dialect, in the hope of defining with greater precision than hitherto its relations with the other Hellenic dialects. The material collected is designed

to serve as the basis of a further discussion of the question in the author's work on the Greek dialects which is now in preparation.

As the closely related daughter dialect of Cyprus necessarily enters largely into the discussion, the paper is entitled the Arcado-Cyprian Dialect, *i.e.* the Arcadian dialect before Cyprian attained to the dignity of individual existence. The attempt to establish the character of this is undertaken: (1) By noting all those points of agreement which are the exclusive property of Arcadian and Cyprian and are not possessed by any other Hellenic dialect. (2) By collecting all those instances of phonetic and inflectional resemblance which are the joint property of both Arcadian and Cyprian and of other

Hellenic dialects. (3) By noting the occurrence of peculiarities common to Arcadian and other dialects but not found in Cyprian, and similarly of peculiarities common to Cyprian along with other dialects, but not found in Arcadian. This excellent method of procedure, which will hardly fail to commend itself to all students of Greek dialects, has been adhered to with great fidelity in the paper before us. The results are in brief as follows:—

The close relation between Arcadian and Cyprian asserted by the tradition in Pausanias viii. 5, 2: 'Αγαπήνωρ δὲ ὁ Ἀγκαίων ἐς Τροίαν ἡγήσατο Ἀρκάδιον. Ἰλίῳ δὲ ἀλοῦσθαι . . . χειμῶν Ἀγαπήνωρα καὶ τὸ Ἀρκάδιον ναυτικὸν κατήνεγκεν ἐς Κύπρον καὶ Πάφον τε Ἀγαπήνωρ ἐγένετο οἰκιστής, is well known to be abundantly confirmed by the epigraphic remains of both dialects. Yet exclusive peculiarities shared by these two dialects alone are not numerous. Smyth enumerates only:—

- (1) The use of ἀπό and ἐξ with the dative.
- (2) The genitive sing. of masc. -ᾱ stems in -av for ᾱο.
- (3) The occurrence of the preposition πός as the equivalent of πρὸς.
- (4) The development of the primitive verbal ending -ντι to -νσι, though the author freely admits that -νσι for the Cyprian is uncertain. Ante-consonantal ν in the interior of a word is everywhere omitted in the latter dialect, so that it is impossible to determine whether Cyprian *e·ke·so·si·* is to be transcribed *ἐξωσι* or *ἐξο(ν)σι*.

The above array of evidence, though scanty, is nevertheless rightly held to speak with no uncertain voice in confirmation of the Agapenor legend.

Some will doubtless be surprised that use has not been made of the occurrence of the preposition *iv* for *ἐν* in Arcadian and Cyprian. But this feature, supposed until recently to be the exclusive possession of these two dialects, has recently turned up in Cretan (see Herforth, *De dialecto Cretica*, p. 210), and is therefore omitted from the list. But proper names in -κρέτης for -κράτης (e.g. Cyprian Ἀριστοκρέτης, Arcadian Σωκρέτης) ought to have been included, since so far as we have any evidence or even testimony their occurrence is restricted to these two dialects. The mention by Johannes Grammaticus of 'Aeolic' κρέτος for κράτος has no especial weight, and certainly cannot be held to imply the existence of proper names in -κρέτης in 'Aeolic.'

As regards the relationship of Arcado-Cyprian to the other dialects of the so-called

Aeolotype (i.e. Thessalian, Lesbian, Boeotian, Elean), Smyth fails to find any single dialectic feature common to all, a fact which clearly shows the unsoundness of postulating a primitive Aeolic unity in the sense in which we have a Doric unity. This is undoubtedly the sense of all careful scholars at present.

Yet, while this is true, Arcado-Cyprian is nevertheless claimed to show vigorous preferences for individual members among the so-called Aeolic dialects. In these claims the author seems to me to go too far, and to base conclusions upon uncertain or too slight data. Thus the points of touch between Arcado-Cyprian and the Homeric dialect are represented as consisting in the possession of the infinitive termination -ηναι (e.g. Arc. ἀπειθῆναι, Cyp. κυμερῆναι, Hom. φορῆναι) and of the peculiar βόλομαι for βοῦλομαι. But, to say nothing of other considerations, the Cyprian κυμερῆναι (which is the sole instance of the formation in this dialect) is quite uncertain, and Cyprian βόλομαι rests upon no more certain evidence than the Hesychian gloss σί βόλε· τί θέλει.

So also the relation between Arcado-Cyprian and Lesbian rests solely upon the occurrence of proper names in -κρέτης in the two former dialects along with the statement of Johannes Grammaticus, above referred to, that κρέτος was used by the Αἰολεῖς.

Between Arcado-Cyprian and Thessalian the relationship exists merely in the occurrence of πόλις for πόλις (in Thessalian οἱ πτολίарχοι, i.e. οἱ πτολίάρχου). But Arcadian πόλις rests only upon the notice in Pausanias viii. 12, 7: καλεῖται δὲ τὸ χωρίον τοῦτο ἐφ' ἡμῶν Πτόλις, whereas all Arcadian inscriptions have πόλις, e.g. Coll. 1222, 12: 1252, 1; πόλιταῖ 1231, A, 44; so that an Arcado-Cyprian πόλις cannot safely be inferred.

A firmer link is found between Arcado-Cyprian, Lesbian and Thessalian, viz. in the occurrence of the preposition ἀνύ for ἀπό, and of κέ for ἀν. But the special relation of Arcado-Cyprian to Boeotian and Thessalian which is claimed by Smyth on the basis of the treatment of the preposition ἐξ I should regard as extremely uncertain. Smyth would follow Schmidt in reading Cyprian ἐσς βασιν, ἐσς τῶι, ἐσς τῶι, where Deecke reads ἐξ βασιν, ἐξ τῶι, ἐξ τῶι. With this ἐσς for ἐξ before consonants he compares the Arcadian, Boeotian, and Thessalian ἐς for ἐξ in the same situation. But Deecke is to be upheld in reading ἐξ in all cases in Cyprian. The syllabic character in ἐξ τῶι, ἐξ τῶι is precisely the same as that found in ὁ Φάναξ Coll. 17, where it can represent nothing else than ξ, and in κᾶρυξ Coll. 65, a bilingual inscription,

where we have the express evidence of the accompanying Greek transliteration. The sign in $\xi\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$ is slightly different, but beyond question. It is true that $\xi\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$, $\xi\beta\tau\omega\iota$ and $\xi\beta\tau\alpha\iota$ all offend against the Greek law concerning triple consonance; but $\xi\beta\sigma\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$ κ.τ.λ. do not relieve this difficulty.

The point of contact between Arcado-Cyprian on the one hand, and Lesbian, Pamphylian, Thessalian, Boeotian on the other, to which Smyth calls attention, is undoubtedly a significant one, viz. the tendency of σ to become ν . But Smyth admits that it is quite doubtful whether Boeotian belongs here, and so far as Thessalian is concerned the only illustration that can be cited is $\delta\pi\acute{o}$, which had already been utilized to show the relationship of Arcado-Cyprian to Lesbian and Thessalian. With these deductions we may hardly conclude more than that Arcado-Cyprian shares the tendency to change σ to ν with Pamphylian and Lesbian. The conclusion drawn by Curtius and others as to the relationship existing between Arcado-Cyprian, Lesbian, Pamphylian, Boeotian and Thessalian, on the basis of the retention of the primitive u -sound in ν , is properly rejected as of significance only when the fact is proved which it claims to establish.

Smyth's thesis of the vigorous preference of Arcado-Cyprian for dialects of the Aeolic type can hardly be admitted to be well established in the light of the foregoing considerations. The cautious student will not venture to claim more than the existence of a tendency in Arcado-Cyprian, Lesbian, Boeotian, Thessalian and Pamphylian, by which σ in unaccented syllables becomes ν , and the existence of $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}$ as common to Arcado-Cyprian, Thessalian and Lesbian. As regards the relation of Arcado-Cyprian to Doric, Smyth finds traces of borrowing on the part of the former in the occurrence of η by the compensative lengthening of ϵ (e.g. Arcadian $\phi\theta\acute{\eta}\rho\omega\nu$ = Att. $\phi\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\omega\nu$, Cyprian $\eta\mu\iota$). The Arcado-Cyprian infinitive ending $-\epsilon\nu$ (if we read Cyprian $\xi\chi\epsilon\nu$ in Coll. 60, 10, 22) may be either borrowed from Doric or possibly be pan-Hellenic; most certainly the latter if we read Ionic $\delta\phi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\epsilon\nu$ in Cauer, *Delectus*, 527.

As to the relation of Arcadian (apart from Cyprian) to other dialects, Smyth finds a connection with Lesbian, Thessalian, and Boeotian in the tendency of contract verbs in $-\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ and $-\acute{\omicron}\omega$ to pass over into the $-\mu$ class; also an affinity with Ionic in the occurrence of $\epsilon\iota$ in the Tegean inscription, while connection with the Doric is seen in η for ϵ by

compensative lengthening, and probably in such infinitives as $\imath\mu\phi\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\nu$ (= $\epsilon\imath\mu\phi\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\nu$).

Special connection of Cyprian (apart from Arcadian) with other dialects is maintained in a number of cases. But several of these are shadowy. Thus the special relation of Cyprian to Aeolic, and of Cyprian to Boeotian is not made out. But Cyprian and Thessalian must be admitted to have a point of identity in Cyprian $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ and Thessalian $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$ (i.e. $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega$), where we should regularly have $\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\iota$, $\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega$. So also Cyprian, Lesbian, and Thessalian have $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ for $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}$ in composition, and Cyprian, Boeotian, Thessalian and Doric agree in changing ϵ to ι before α , ω (though this is rare in Thessalian).

Special relation of Cyprian to Ionic-Attic on the basis of the Cyprian genitives $\acute{\alpha}\mu\iota(\nu)\tau\omega$ (from $\acute{\alpha}\mu\iota\tau\tau\alpha\varsigma$), $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\phi\alpha\gamma\acute{\omicron}\rho\omega$ (instead of $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\phi\alpha\gamma\acute{\omicron}\rho\alpha\nu$, cf. Cyprian $\acute{\omicron}\nu\alpha\sigma\alpha\gamma\acute{\omicron}\rho\alpha\nu$ and similar genitives) seems doubtful. $\acute{\alpha}\mu\iota(\nu)\tau\omega$ is no longer read by Deecke, and $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\phi\alpha\gamma\acute{\omicron}\rho\omega$, as admitted by Smyth himself (*Addenda*, p. 159), is not a current formation, only a single instance being known where Ionic names in $-\gamma\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\varsigma$ form the gen. in $-\gamma\acute{\omicron}\rho\omega$, while the formation in $-\gamma\acute{\omicron}\rho\epsilon\omega$ is frequent. Cyprian $\delta\tau\epsilon$ and $\pi\omega\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ would seem to constitute the only point of special relationship between this dialect and Ionic-Attic.

Between Cyprian and Doric the special relationship claimed by Smyth is contingent, at least in part, upon the interpretation of uncertain dialectic phenomena. Thus if we admit, for Cyprian, ω and η by compensative lengthening of σ and ϵ ; or if we admit the expulsion of secondary intervocalic σ (in the Cyprian $\phi\rho\omicron\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega\iota$ for $\phi\rho\omicron\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega\sigma\iota$ Coll. 68, 4; $\delta\mu\acute{\omega}\omega\iota\varsigma$ 69), we shall readily recognize Doric affinities. But, as long as the correct interpretation of the Cyprian forms is so doubtful, it will hardly do to build upon them. Doric influence, however, seems to manifest itself in the rare Cyprian gen. in $\acute{\alpha}$ for $-\alpha\nu$, e.g. $\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta\acute{\nu}\iota\alpha$ Coll. 60, 18, and in the contraction of $\epsilon\sigma$ to ω in $\nu\omega\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\mu\omega\varsigma$, *Berliner Philologischer Wochenschrift*, 1886, no. 42, col. 1323.

A special interest attaches to Smyth's paper from the fact that he has appended to his discussion of the relationship between Arcado-Cyprian and other dialects an outline of the Cyprian dialect itself. This is brief and not designed to discuss theories to any extent or to deal exhaustively with the epigraphic material, yet as the first ¹ published

¹ A fuller treatment of the subject is attempted in a paper of my own, *On the Sounds and Inflections of the Cyprian Dialect*, in the *Nebraska University Studies*, I. 2, which was already in press at the time of the appearance of Dr. Smyth's article.

attempt at anything like a systematic summary of the facts of Cyprian grammar it commands attention. I venture to notice in detail several questions touched upon by Smyth in this connection.

1. *ῥήνω*, Deecke's reading in Coll. 68, 1, which is taken by him for *ῥείνω* and has generally passed unchallenged, is properly rejected by Smyth (p. 115). The *ei* of *ῥείνω* is the genuine diphthong, as is shown by Attic inscriptions written in the Old Alphabet, where we have EI. Cyprian *η* cannot stand as the equivalent of this genuine *ei*, but only of that *ei* which arises from compensative lengthening or contraction.

2. *πός*, Coll. 60, 19, 20, 21, which Baunack and Meister wish to explain as derived from *πορί* through the medium of an assumed **ποσί* (ante-vocalic form), is taken by Smyth (p. 67) after Bechtel (*Bezz. Beitr.* x. p. 287) as for **πότ-s*. The weakness of the view advocated by Baunack and Meister is well characterized by the remark that in their explanation the form **ποσί*, like the Pelasgians, is there only to be driven away, since it is purely imaginary and found in no dialect or literary monument.

3. Deecke's reading *πότι* (Coll. 68, 1) as voc. sing. of *πότις* (for *πόσις*), 'lord,' is also rejected (p. 68). Deecke's reading would compel us to admit the retention of *τ* before *ι*, in spite of the fact that this is elsewhere regularly assibilated, while Cyprian *πόσις* occurs in a clear instance in Coll. 26, 2. To these phonetic considerations might have been added the fact that the signification 'lord' is foreign to the word in Greek, though Skrt. *patis* and even Greek *πότνια* point unmistakably to the primitive signification as that of *power, mastery*.

4. *ἦ κε* is Deecke's reading in Coll. 60, 10, 23, i.e. *εἴ κε* (= *εἰάν*). Meyer (*Gr. Gr.* § 113) has rejected this and proposes *ἦν κε* (*ἦν* for *εἰάν*), the final *ν* being omitted as not infrequently in Cyprian. Meyer compares Homeric *εἰάν κε* as a syntactical parallel. But Smyth (p. 72) rightly defends Deecke's reading in view of Cretan *ἦ* in the Gortynian inscription iv. 31; v. 9, and cites with approval Baunack's explanation of the form as instrumental of the root *svō-* (cf. Laconian *πή-ποκα* from root *πο-*). It might be added that Meyer's explanation of Cyprian *ἦν* for *εἰάν* is against the clear laws of the dialect as regards the contraction of *εα*. This combination does not contract, but either remains unchanged or (in Italian inscriptions) becomes *ια*.

5. *ιαρός* (as the equivalent of *ιέρως*) is evidently claimed for Cyprian (p. 82), especially

on the basis of *ἱαρότατος*, Coll. 41, though Deecke (*Bezz. Beitr.* xi. p. 317) has announced that the inscription, which was hitherto read from right to left, is to be read from left to right. Compare also Meister in *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1887, no. 52, who has further worked out the text. This deprives us of *ἱαρότατος*. The other forms cited by Smyth, *ιαρά* (= *ιαρά?*) and *ἱαρό(ν)δαν*, cannot authorize the conclusion that *ιαρός* existed by the side of *ιέρως* in Cyprian.

6. *ῥείσος* (on the basis of Deecke's reading *ῥείσης*, Coll. 68, 1) is accepted by Smyth (p. 85) as the Cyprian form of *ίος*. But the primitive form of this adjective was *ῥίος* (cf. Cretan *ῥίος*, *ῥίος*, *ῥίος* in the Gortynian inscription). Smyth does not explain the precise origin of *ῥείσος*. The *ε* may easily be accounted for as prothetic before the initial *ρ*. Cf. Homeric *ῥίος* (the correct form—not *ῥίος*) for **ῥίος*, i.e. **ῥίος*. But *ῥει-* as the Cyprian resultant of *ῥίος* is not conceivable. Possibly we might assume a strong stem *ῥει-* by the side of *ῥί-*. But the Ionic *η* of the termination cannot be correct, and considering the many difficulties of the context it would seem best to reject the former altogether.

7. So also with the peculiar *ἑπισταις* in the same inscription (Coll. 68, 3), which Smyth (following Deecke) accepts (p. 119) without apparent hesitation, as for *ἑπισταις*, though admitting that the form stands alone.

8. Expulsion of intervocalic secondary *σ* (arising from *τ*), claimed by Deecke in *φρονέω* for *φρονέω* Coll. 68, 4 and *διμώσις* for *διμώσις* Coll. 69, and admitted by Smyth (p. 112), should be accepted with caution, as the reading of neither inscription (in spite of Deecke) can fairly be held to be assured until made to yield a better sense than at present. It is true that certain Cyprian glosses preserved in Hesychius do illustrate the disappearance of intervocalic *σ*. But I should be inclined to attribute these to a later stage of the Cyprian than is known to us from inscriptions. Moreover it should be noted that these glosses never exemplify the loss of the secondary *σ* arising from *τ*, which is the case we have to deal with. Hence though the phenomenon in question is not unparalleled (e.g. Laconian *ἐνιβόαις*, Roehl, *I.G.A.* 79, 15), yet it is exceedingly doubtful for Cyprian.

9. How *σπῆος* (p. 112) is to be maintained as the contraction of *σπέος* (i.e. **σπέφος*), Coll. 31, 32, is difficult to understand. Cyprian *-εος* regularly becomes *-εο-* by aphaeresis of the second *ε*, e.g. *Θεοκλέος* for *Θεοκλέος*, i.e. *-έφος*. So also in Arcadian.

Hence *σπέφεος would become σπέος, which I should read, rejecting Deecke's σπέως, despite the resulting identity of nom. and gen.

10. As to the Cyprian αἰλων (= ἄλλων) in the Bronze Tablet, Coll. 60, 1, and the recently discovered Cyprian 'Απειλωνι, *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1886, no. 42, col. 1323, Smyth takes these (p. 114) as arising not by epenthesis from *ἄλιος, *'Απέλιων, as is commonly done, but as a further Cyprian development of an Arcado-Cyprian ἄλλος and 'Απέλλων. For the former of these he compares Cretan αἰκά = ἄλκη; θεύγω = θέλω. Smyth's view is decidedly preferable to any other. The Arcado-Cyprian form must have been ἄλλος and Cyprian αἰλος must have developed from this. So with 'Απειλων.

11. Smyth seems to share (p. 109) Voigt's suspicion of κατέθεσαν, Deecke's reading in Coll. 20. But I see no good reason why this form may not be explained as a contamination of κατέθην, found in Coll. 60, 27, and κατέθεσαν. The latter though not found may be safely assumed as a current form.

12. As to Smyth's endorsement (p. 68) of μῖ(ν) εὐξάμενος, Hall's proposed reading in Coll. 45, where Deecke reads εὐξάμενος (ῖ = ἐπὶ), it should be borne in mind that μῖ(ν) with omitted final nasal cannot be read before a vowel in Cyprian. Hence the reading is untenable. Voigt's μῖν ἔθηκε in the same inscription (where Deecke reads ἐνέθηκε) is no more tenable, since μῖν for μέν (i.e. μέν = μέ) is the ante-consonantal form; μέν the form employed before vowels. Cf. μῖν ἔστασαν Coll. 71. I should therefore retain Deecke's reading in both instances.

13. Smyth is inaccurate in his statement (p. 109) concerning the change of Cyprian ε to ι. He implies that the ε of εα or εο where these arise from εσα, εσο, does not be-

come ι. Yet the Bronze Tablet has ἀρελίja for -είa, i.e. -είa: τέρχνija for τέρχνεa i.e. -εα. The facts seem rather to be these: in the Bronze Tablet, and in fact in all Italian inscriptions, ε invariably becomes ι before α, ο, and ω. Elsewhere it is generally retained.

14. On p. 118, Smyth is correct in insisting (against Deecke, *Bezz. Beitr.* vi, 79) that the Cyprian κάτι (κάτ' 'Ηδαλίω, Coll. 59, 3) cannot be taken as the progenitor (through *κάσι, *κάι) of the vulgar καί. Cyprian κάς, κά (= καί) are also to be held separate from both κάτι and καί.

15. The Cyprian gen. Εὐφαγόρω Coll. 153, 154, which Smyth was at first inclined (p. 111) to refer to Ionic influence (following Meyer, *Gr. Gr.* § 345), is admitted in the Addenda, p. 159, to be doubtful. This is unquestionably the more prudent view, as already indicated above.

16. The Arcadian forms in -ής (for εὐς), viz. ιαρήs, ιερήs, γραφήs, are taken (p. 79) along with the solitary Cyprian ἱερής as representing a primitive ē declension. The Boeotian forms in -ει (for -εῖς, i.e. -ης), e.g. Μένει etc., are referred to the same category. This suggestion is deserving of consideration, though the facts are too scanty to justify more than a bare hypothesis.

17. The Arcadian δαμοργός, which is taken (p. 95) as for δαμωργός (contracted from δαμο(φ)εργός) with ω shortened to ο, is explained in the Addenda, p. 158, as for δαμοεργός with aphaeresis of the ε. The latter view is distinctly preferable since the shortening of a long vowel before liquid consonant is doubtful for a period of the language subsequent to the disappearance of φ. In my own paper I have referred δαμοργός to δαμωργός, assuming aphaeresis of the first ο.

CHAS. E. BENNETT,

University of Nebraska.

HISTORY OF GREECE.

A History of Greece, by EVELYN ABBOTT, M.A., LL.D. Part I. (London, 1888.) 10s. 6d.

A NEW history of Greece written in English and summarizing the results of recent research has long been needed. In Germany during the last thirty years the greatest activity has been displayed in the production of historical works; the labour has been

carefully divided and every branch of historical study has been exhaustively investigated. The results so acquired have been collected and applied to general history, and the works of Curtius, Duncker, Holm and Busolt contain the best evidence of the energy of German historians. On the other hand Sir G. W. Cox is the only English writer since Thirlwall and Grote who has produced a Greek history of any importance.

It is time, therefore, for us to revise the old conclusions in the light of the new material which has been accumulated, and this task Dr. Abbott has undertaken.

The first volume of his work, which has recently been published, contains 550 pages and covers the period from the earliest times to the reforms of Clisthenes. A second part is to continue the history until the end of the Peloponnesian war. It is not stated whether Dr. Abbott intends to include the history of the succeeding century in his work.

He has in the volume before us made a careful and thorough digest of existing materials. While he follows and quotes the ancient authorities, his study of modern writers is equally comprehensive. In the conclusions drawn from the original sources Dr. Abbott is cautious and sceptical. There is always most room for originality where the direct record is most scanty, but Dr. Abbott has not cared to make good the deficiency of original material by imaginative conjectures. He has no sympathy with the ingenious theories with which, for example, Gilbert and others explain early Spartan history, and his view of Lycurgus and the Rhetrae is perfectly orthodox. Generally speaking his conclusions on disputed points are negative rather than positive, and there are cases in which he seems to carry the critical instinct too far. For instance, he not only refuses to form any decisive theory on the date of the Homeric poems, but denies that we can derive from them historical results of any value with regard to Hellenic life and civilization. This is an extreme conclusion, which is the more to be deplored as, if we reject the evidence of Homer, we deprive ourselves of a vivid and complete picture of early society.

The scheme of Dr. Abbott's book involves a separate discussion of the different states of Greece, both in the legendary and at a later period. Hence only the first seventy pages are concerned with Greece as a whole, and for the rest of the book (with slight exceptions) each state is considered apart from the others. This is a matter for regret. Greek history in spite of the isolation of the different states has a unity of its own; in particular we can trace a uniformity of constitutional change and a regular succession of forms of government, which can best be treated by the comparative method. For

the most part Dr. Abbott does not group or compare the history of the different states; the account of the Greek colonies (pp. 352—363) and the few pages devoted to a general description of the tyrants are so clear and suggestive that we can only regret that he has not applied the same method in discussing the development of states and the successive changes of government.

Throughout the work Dr. Abbott is careful to discuss legends, religious rites and festivals, especially when they illustrate or explain other aspects of history. He lays down the principle that 'No one mode of explaining the Greek legends can be safely adopted to the exclusion of others'; and he points to the possible methods in which myths may have arisen, although he does not attempt to explain the origin of each legend, or indeed to separate what is historical in them from what is mythical. In connection with the discussion of prehistoric events it is noteworthy that Dr. Abbott says nothing of the original immigration of the Greek stock into Greece.

The account of constitutional changes at Athens is on the whole excellent. It is rather difficult to understand what view Dr. Abbott takes of the Athenian council before Solon. In attributing the introduction of the lot in the appointment of magistrates to Clisthenes, Dr. Abbott is at variance with almost all other modern authorities, and his view requires fuller discussion than he gives it. Grote and his successors disregard the testimony of Herodotus (vi. 109) and put the introduction of the lot at some time within the fifth century. Grote leaves the date indeterminate; Müller-Strübing and Duncker bring it into connection with the reform of Aristides; Busolt puts it as late as 460, and thinks that the change was part of the general reforms of Pericles and Ephialtes. It is impossible to arrive at any certain result, but the frequency with which well-known names occur in the list of chief archons before 478 (*e.g.* Themistocles in 493 and 482, Aristides in 489 and Xanthippus in 479) makes it likely that the principle of election was preserved, at least until the reform of Aristides.

In conclusion it is worth noting that the Grotian spelling of Greek proper names does not gain ground in England; Dr. Abbott is not a convert.

L. WHIBLEY.

ANCIENT ROME.

Ancient Rome in the Light of Recent Discoveries,
by RODOLFO LANCIANI, LL.D. (Harv.).
London, Macmillan. 24s.

THE title of this work and the distinguished name of its author will naturally raise somewhat high expectations in the minds of students of Roman archaeology. Few archaeologists possess so wide a knowledge of classical authors combined with so intimate an acquaintance with existing remains as does Signor Lanciani, whose official position as director of excavations in Rome gives him advantages which, to the same degree, can be enjoyed by no one else.

Considering this it must be admitted that his last work is a very disappointing one, and the reader cannot but feel that with a little more trouble and thought it might have been made a book of real scientific value, instead of being merely a sort of popular handbook, adapted for the use of the average tourist rather than for real students of this very important subject.

Measuring, however, this handsome volume by the lower standard, there is a great deal to be said in its praise. The mere chips of such a workshop as Signor Lanciani's cannot fail to contain among them much that is both new and valuable.

In his first chapter on 'The Renaissance of Archaeological Studies' the author gives many interesting facts with regard to the state of Rome in the mediæval period, and examples to show that reverence for relics of the past survived in the minds of a few of the Romans even during the darkest period of what used popularly to be called the 'Dark Ages.'

Signor Lanciani points out that Rome 'can boast of having had a museum, not of small objects, however precious, but a museum containing the grandest productions of ancient art, at least since the time of Charlemagne and the ninth century of our era.' This little museum was contained in the ancient papal palace of the Lateran; and in it were certain bronzes which fortunately still exist—namely the Capitoline Wolf, the tablet of the *Lex Regia*, the colossal head of Domitian, and lastly the noble equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius, which is usually said to have been found near S. Croce in Gerusalemme, but, as Signor Lanciani remarks, 'It was never found, because it was never lost.'

The next chapter on 'The Prehistoric Life of Rome,' which the author takes as beginning precisely in the orthodox year 754 B.C., belongs rather to the domain of fancy than of strictly scientific deduction. According to Signor Lanciani, Rome, originally a village of Alban emigrants, was named 'from its most prominent topographical feature, from its connection with the Rumon or river: they called it *Roma*, which means the "town of the river" . . . they called the leader of the settlement *Romulus*, which means the "man from the town of the river." All that I have said is so simple and matter-of-fact that it conveys persuasion at once, as plain truth always does. But if another argument is required to prove that the names *Roma* and *Romulus* are derived from the aboriginal word *Rumon* or stream, here it is at hand.' The author then goes on to explain that this additional proof is derived from the fact that one of the gates of the ancient city was called the *Porta Romana*, which was so called 'because it led to the *Rumon* or river.' On turning, however, to the author's plan of the Palatine hill, we find that he places the site of the *Porta Romana* at the usually accepted place, namely the angle of the Palatine that looks down upon the Forum Romanum, and therefore quite away from the side towards the river.

Those chapters in which Signor Lanciani leaves such theorizing alone and relates his own experiences as an excavator are much more worthy of attention. He gives a very vivid account of the horrors of that great charnel-field on the Esquiline, which Maecenas converted into healthy gardens by burying the whole surface in a deep mass of pure earth. A portion of the Esquiline cemetery about 1000 feet long by 300 deep was reserved for 'slaves, beggars, prisoners and others, who were thrown in revolting confusion into common pits or fosses.' During the laying out the foundations of one of the most dreary quarters of modern Rome Signor Lanciani had opportunities of examining a large number of these pits. He writes: 'In many cases the contents of each vault were reduced to a uniform mass of black, viscid, pestilent, unctuous matter: in a few cases the bones could in a measure be singled out and identified. The reader will hardly believe me when I say that men and beasts, bodies and carcasses, and any kind of un-

mentionable refuse of the town were heaped up in those dens.' The wonder is that some fearful outbreak of disease did not occur as a result of this excavation of old horrors, and it can hardly be pleasant for the dwellers in the new stucco palaces to reflect upon what sort of a soil their dwellings stand. Signor Lanciani tells a curious story of how one of the new houses at the corner of the Via Carlo-Alberto and Via Mazzini collapsed while in process of erection, because (as it was afterwards discovered) half of its foundations extended over 'the site of the ditch, filled up with thousands upon thousands of corpses, which, when brought in contact with the air after twenty centuries, had crumbled into dust or nothing, leaving open a huge chasm.'

With regard to the prevalence of malarious fevers in early times, the author is inclined to trace a connection between the dying out of the volcanic fires in the Campagna round Rome and the growth of malaria. This may be quite reasonable, but there is not sufficient evidence to justify such a statement as this—'There can no longer be any doubt that malaria invaded the volcanic regions the very minute they ceased to be volcanic.' Among the many altars dedicated in Rome to the goddess of Fever and other similar deities, Signor Lanciani mentions one which he himself discovered. 'Near the modern railway station I have found, myself, an altar dedicated to Verminus, the god of microbes: and lastly, in the very centre of the Roman forum, there was an altar sacred to Cloacina, a goddess of typhoid, I suppose.' If this passage is meant seriously, it would pre-suppose on the part of the ancient Romans an acquaintance with the character and causes of disease far beyond any which they can possibly have possessed—on a par in fact with microscopic discoveries only made within the last twenty years.

Under the heading 'Police and Fire Department' Signor Lanciani gives an interesting sketch of the cohorts of *Vigiles* and their various *excubitoria* and *stationes*, several of which have been discovered within recent years—official quarters, not like the plain, whitewashed buildings of our modern police and firemen, but handsomely designed buildings, richly decorated with marble linings, stucco reliefs, and mosaic pavements.

The author is of opinion that even under the Empire there was no system of lighting used in the public streets of Rome, but this need appears to have been supplied soon after the end of the second century.

Some of the *graffiti*, scratched on the stuccoed walls of the barrack of the 7th cohort near the church of S. Crisogono in Trastevere, seem to show that the division of the *Vigiles*, known as the *Vigiles Sebaciari*, had charge of the lighting of the streets and public buildings of Rome—the *Sebaciaria*, an institution which probably dated from the time of Caracalla. In the ruins of this *excubitorium* a curious bronze torch was found, with a flame-like cone at the top, formed hollow to hold some combustible substance. The hole for the flame is placed laterally, as if the torch was intended to be set in a socket and fixed leaning at an angle from the wall, naphtha or some other natural spirit being used as the source of light.

Signor Lanciani mentions the discovery of seven torches or 'sticks of fir-wood coated with tar,' a very dangerous means of lighting used in the subterranean shrine of Mithras, which formed part of a private house near the Church of S. Martino ai monti. The author refers to the difficulty of understanding how such incombustible buildings as those of ancient Rome could have been so often destroyed by fire, as we know they were from unimpeachable records. How the Pantheon could have been injured by fire certainly is a mystery, as concrete, brick, marble, and bronze are the only materials used in its construction.

But the Pantheon is quite an exceptional building in having had no external wooden roof, and with regard to other buildings, the fire which in 1823 ruined the Basilica of *S. Paolo fuori le mura* showed clearly how much injury fire could do to a structure in which nothing was of wood except the roof. The blazing beams of the roof falling in to the nave soon cracked or calcined the marble columns of the arcade in such a way that the whole building was ready to fall, and this must have happened in many a temple of ancient Rome.

Again, Signor Lanciani writes: 'It is also a mystery to me how the Coliseum could have been set into a blaze by a thunderbolt on August 23, A.D. 217, and that it should have taken not less than six years to repair the damage.' The explanation of this seems less difficult; up to that time the upper galleries or *maeniana* of the Coliseum appear to have been of wood, and so of course would burn with great rapidity. The whole of the present upper story, above the third order of columns and arches, is of later date than the fire of 217 A.D., and was, no doubt, built to replace the burnt wooden story. Its great height and extent make

six years seem no unreasonable time for the work to have taken.

At page 287 the author gives a very curious fact about the colossal bronze Hercules now in the circular hall of the Vatican. 'Very few persons know of the existence of a hole in the back of the head, through which a full-grown youth could easily make his way into the colossus.' This he suggests was a priestly device for making the statue deliver oracular responses — 'Hercules, like Aesculapius, Apollo, and the Fortune, was undoubtedly an oracular god, as shown by the existence of many temples in which *responsa* or oracles were given in his name.'

The whole volume is very prettily illustrated with photographs and wood-cuts of the clever American style. Unfortunately

very few measured plans are given, and some of these are much out of date. The plan of the Palatine hill is simply a reprint of a not very accurate plan made fully fifteen years ago, and so shows none of the recent discoveries. That too of the House of the Vestals is an incomplete one, made before the building was fully exposed, though it would have been easy to bring it up to the present date by adding the parts excavated since the end of 1883.

It is much to be hoped that some day Signor Lanciani may give us a work on the same subject, but of far greater and more scientific value than this. Probably no one alive is so well qualified to do so: certainly no one has such complete command of the requisite materials.

THE FINANCIAL SYSTEM OF THE ROMANS.

Essai sur les Finances et la Comptabilité publique chez les Romains, par GUSTAVE HUMBERT, Ancien Procureur-général près la Cour des Comptes. Paris. Thorin. 1887. 2 vols. 18 fcs.

THIS is a work of the most exhaustive and complete nature on a special branch of Roman administration, gathering together under a systematic arrangement all the scattered details bearing on the subject in the three periods of Roman history, the republic, the early empire, and later empire — the periods in which the Roman financial system arose, was organized, and decayed. The questions which the author sets himself to answer are, what legislative authority initiated any tax, what officers administered it, whether as directors or actual accountants, and what control was exercised over these administrators. The general clearness of the arrangement, together with an excellent index and table of contents, makes the book very convenient for purposes of reference.

Beginning with the republic, M. Humbert shows that the legislative initiation in the matter of taxation and finance generally came from the senate. Acting in a manner as their agents were two classes of officials, the first described as '*ordonnateurs*' (directors), who issued orders and regulations concerning the receipts and expenditure, but who had no handling of the moneys; this latter function belonging to the second class of officials, '*comptables*' ('accountants'

in the old sense of the word). The former were the consuls and afterwards the censors, sometimes the aediles, never the dictator; and in the colonies and municipia certain curators: the latter were the quaestors, whether of the city, the army, or the municipalities, and their subordinates. The chief blot in the financial system of the Romans was the absence of an efficient control over the officials. The administrative and judicial control were both committed to a *political* body, the senate or the knights, who were interested in screening guilty administrators belonging to their own order. M. Humbert dwells much on the importance of placing the administration and the judicial control of the finances in entirely different hands, and he thinks it high time for England to establish such an independent jurisdiction, and not to trust exclusively to the not too strict scrutiny of the Audit Office.

Going on to the period of the early empire — the dyarchy as Mommsen has taught us to call it — M. Humbert shows in detail who were the initiators, directors, and accountants of the several exchequers. Thus the senate had formally the right of initiation in all that concerned the *Aerarium Saturni*, though the emperor practically invaded their privileges by directing them in an oratio what to propose. Indeed all through the dyarchy the emperor was ever more and more encroaching on the functions of the senate. The censors and consuls were the

directors of the aerarium; the 'accountants,' variously named during the first years of the empire, from Nero's time were always called *praefecti aerarii* and nominated by the emperor from among the senators who had been praetors. The *aerarium militare* had the emperor at its head with *praefecti* at Rome and the provincial governors or imperial procurators in the provinces as directors, the 'accountants' being three *praefecti* chosen by lot and their subordinates. Again, the *fiscus* had the emperor at its head; the directors were centralized by Pallas under the official called a *rationibus*; the 'accountants' were freedmen *dispensatores*. In the municipalities their senate was the initiator, the *duoviri* the chief directors, and the quaestor with his subordinates the 'accountants.' In conclusion a chapter is devoted to setting out how far and to whom the treasury officials had to submit their proceedings and accounts, and the means of punishing fraudulent officials.

In the later empire the emperor was the sole head. He was 'the living personification of law and of all the powers in the state' (ii. 251). The directors were the different magistrates or their deputies, the *comites sacrarum largitionum, rei privatae, magistri officiorum, praefectus praetoris*, &c., and their subordinates. The 'accountants' were *susceptores* and *exactores*. The distinction between 'ordonnateurs' and 'comptables' M. Humbert thinks is strongly marked in the separation of the *tabularii* and *susceptores* (*Cod. Just.* xii. 49 (50), 4, compared with x. 72 (70), 13), though he acknowledges that in the later empire it is not always very apparent owing to the disappearance of the quaestors and the suppression of the category of the senatorial provinces (ii. 19). As to administrative control, cases of litigation between individuals and the state in matters of taxation went before the *rationalis* or *censitor*, or in case of a contract entered into between the state and an individual, before the ordinary judge. The directors had to submit their accounts to the emperor or heads of departments who had *discussores* under them, in the municipalities to the *duoviri*, and if found unsatisfactory, punishment was inflicted by the heads of the departments.

The above framework is filled with all the necessary detail. In each book there are elaborate discussions on the different branches of the finances, receipts and expenditure, the different exchequers, and on the question how far there were regular budgets. In the imperial periods we find

accounts of the gradual growth in numbers and power of the multifarious financial officials, of the elaborate system of land taxation, and of the fiscal condition of the provinces and municipal towns. Apropos of the land-revenue system M. Humbert quotes at great length in the notes (Part iii. 895, 899) the thorough-going discussions of Matthiass on the *Jugatio* and of Karlowa on the *Tributum* and *Capitatio*, and gives (Note 888) a series of testimonies from other historians and jurists to the disastrous effect of the union of administration and jurisdiction in the same hands. Everywhere there is the richest abundance of facts and references collected. Indeed that is only what is to be expected from M. Humbert's long labours for the great French Dictionary of Antiquities now in progress to which he, Lenormant, and Saglio are the chief contributors. If they were not, the Dictionary were not. The vast and exhaustive learning M. Humbert has collected for the legal and administrative articles therein contained has given him a complete mastery of all the erudition now available on the Roman financial system; and his clear and orderly mind, working on a subject of which he has intimate practical knowledge, has brought about a very beautiful cosmos out of that chaos of material. In the first two books he mainly follows Mommsen's *Staatsrecht* and Marquardt's *Staatsverwaltung*, with the addition in the second book of Hirschfeld's *Verwaltungsgeschichte*. He is ever ready to acknowledge in the warmest terms his obligations to these works, which must be the starting-point of any serious investigation of Roman state law or administration. But it is hard in reading the works of Mommsen to keep one's self from being dominated by his immense learning, his masterly handling of that learning and his powerfully insistent style. It is no small praise to M. Humbert to say that he is never so dominated, but always maintains a sober critical attitude. Thus, to take one example in the *Staatsrecht* (ii. 2 959), Mommsen combats Hirschfeld for refusing to accede to his view that the emperor was owner of the *fiscus*, but M. Humbert (i. p. 199) agrees with Hirschfeld, and points out that the legal test of anything being the property of a man was that if he died intestate it should pass to his *sui heredes, agnati, or gentiles*, which characteristic certainly never belonged to the *fiscus*. Similarly in the third book, where M. Humbert follows mainly Godefroi's notes on the Theodosian Code and M. Bouchard's

Essai sur l'Administration des Finances, &c., he at times dissents definitely and with good reason from them, as for example (Note 678) from their view that the *rationalis rei privatae* was more than a director, and had *arcarii* in his office; and (ii. p. 9, and Note

852) from their opinion that the *curator reipublicae* and *curator kalendarii* had the actual handling of money and so functions other than those of directors.

L. C. PURSER.

RÖMISCHES STAATSRICHT.

Römisches Staatsrecht von THEODOR MOMMSEN.
Dritter Band: II Abth. Der Senat. 10 Mk.

WITH this volume is concluded the great and without exaggeration epoch-making work, the *Handbuch der Römischen Alterthümer*, by Mommsen and Marquardt. The *Staatsverwaltung*, written by the latter, as also his *Privatleben*, have been published now for some years, but the third volume of the *Staatsrecht*, which was to deal with the rights of the senate and the citizens, has for a considerable time been delayed, and has caused a gap which we have hitherto had to fill either from scattered notices in the *Römische Geschichte*, or with better success from the *Römische Forschungen*. The publication of *Die Bürgerschaft* at the close of last year, and the present volume on the senate at last make the *Staatsrecht* complete. To attribute absolute finality to the *Handbuch* as a whole, in the face of the remarkable development of our knowledge of Roman antiquities during the past fifty years, would be rash and unreasonable; and indeed, as regards the *Staatsverwaltung*, it is almost certain that the fresh stores of epigraphical evidence, of which the successive issues of the *Ephemeris Epigraphica* are standing proofs, will necessitate many modifications and corrections of Marquardt's views. But the *Staatsrecht* stands on somewhat different ground. The period in which the Roman Constitution in relation to the ordinary magistracies, the comitia and the republican senate, reached its full development is illustrated in a very secondary degree by epigraphical evidence, while of the literary materials on which it is most dependent Dr. Mommsen has a knowledge and a mastery which, joined to his thorough training in jurisprudence, place him in a position quite unique. Nor is the method which he employs one which is likely to be reversed with any fruitful results. The attractive region of theory, hypothesis, and reconstruction of prehistoric institutions is one which

he consistently renounces. Taking his stand on what is attested by complete historical evidence, he traces institutions backwards into times less distinctly known, never however suffering any considerable gap to intervene between his data and the inferences drawn from them. No doubt the renunciation which this method implies precludes the possibility of a Roman Constitutional History in any complete sense. But a Constitutional History the *Staatsrecht* does not claim to be. It is rather the presentation of Roman political institutions as they mutually cohere and form parts of a system. Thus it is not necessary to decide, though it would be interesting to know, whether the Senate in its first origin was in a real sense intended to represent the gentes, and whether the original senators therefore were delegated by their gentes rather than appointed by the king. But it is necessary on the one side to determine the constitutional relations between the executive and the senate, and on the other to point out the lines of demarcation between the political spheres of the senate and the comitia. Again, it is not necessary to reconcile the conflicting statements of historians as to the original number of the senate, or its increase or duplication by Tarquinius, but it is necessary to know in what way the normal number when fixed was maintained. With Dr. Mommsen's radical conception of the senate's constitutional position *de jure* and *de facto*, the readers of his *History* and of the *Römische Forschungen* are to some extent already familiar, but what was broadly stated in the former works without a full citation of references is now worked out in detail, and the position, function, and privileges of the senate receive an exhaustive treatment in reference to the various departments of legislation, finance, foreign policy, provincial government, and in fact all public acts in which the senate either *de jure* or by means of usurpation and encroachment took the leading part. Out of such a mass of

material it is impossible in a short notice to touch upon more than a few points.

That during the best years of the Republic the senate was *de facto* the supreme governing body there is no dispute. Controversy can only arise on the question—Was it also *de jure* supreme? or was its position a usurpation of functions constitutionally belonging to the executive or the popular assemblies? Dr. Mommsen takes the latter view. *De jure* the senate was merely a deliberating and advising board, absolutely without initiative of its own, without the means of directly entering into relations either with the citizen-body or with foreign states, and whose resolutions were not legally binding upon the executive. But from this position it gradually emancipated itself. The life-long position of its members, the weight of their experience as mostly ex-magistrates, the early control which the senate gained of financial matters and external policy, and judicious use of tribunician influence, were the chief means of a gradual usurpation of much wider powers. In the main no doubt this theory is correct, but none the less it involves a certain break of continuity in the development of the senate at the point when plebeians were first admitted into it. As E. Herzog has pointed out, the interregnum and the *patrum auctoritas*, originally functions of the senate as a whole, do imply a certain supremacy and sovereignty in the position of the original senate, even if the latter of the two privileges was, as Mommsen holds, more a negative *Nomophulaky* than an active check on popular measures. These functions were no doubt reserved (and the proof of this Mommsen now gives in full detail) to the patrician members of the plebeio-patrician senate of the Republic. But was this supreme position of the senate constitutionally altered by the admission of plebeians? Was not, on the contrary, the supremacy still maintained, though made more vague and less dependent on this or that particular function, and must we not add this latent sovereignty handed down from the original senate to the means by which the later senate with which we are familiar gained its position? and is it not truer to say that the development of the senate was less a usurpation than a transformation of a latent sovereignty into a practical supremacy *pari passu* with the conditions and circumstances of Rome's own development? This would seem to be the more probable view, and indeed Dr. Mommsen himself in a previous volume speaks of the *Nomophulaky* of the plebeio-patrician senate as

'eine Fortsetzung oder Wiederaufnahme der alten *patrum auctoritas*.' A typical example of Dr. Mommsen's method of dovetailing particular points into the general system of the constitution is his explanation of the much disputed term '*pedarii*.' Correcting the mistaken definition of Gellius, he shows that *pedarii* were those senators who had the right to vote, but not the right '*sententiam dicendi*.' Who were these senators, and what constituted the right '*sententiam dicendi*?' According to Mommsen the answer to the latter question is, a magisterial position. Accordingly all patricians, as potentially *interreges*, had the right, and all those, whether patrician or plebeian, who entered it after tenure of a magistracy had it too. The *pedarii* were therefore those plebeians who were '*lecti a censoribus*' without having held a magistracy. After the Sullan restoration this class no longer existed, and therefore the term '*pedarii*' changes its meaning, and denotes the two lower classes of *aedilicii* and *tribunicii* in opposition to *consulares* and *praetorii*. This view, if correct, and it certainly seems to answer to all the passages in our authorities, is of course the answer to Herzog's contention that the plebeian senators must from their first admission have had the full senatorial rights. Again to the formal distinction between the terms *senatus decretum* and *senatus consultum* Dr. Mommsen assigns a constitutional meaning which has an important bearing on the development of the senate. Every resolution of the senate was a joint act performed by the presiding magistrate and the senate. As long as the most important part was assigned to the former, the result was a *decretum* of the magistrate *de sententia senatus*, or, by an abbreviation, *decretum senatus*. But as the magistrate became subordinated to the senate, the term *senatus consultum*, as giving greater prominence to the senate's part, became the usual expression, and indeed, in the period known to us, is the only term in regular use. It is interesting to compare this view with that of Herzog, who says '*Senatus consultum* mag der alteren Auffassung entsprechen, wonach der Senat das consilium des Beamten bildete, *decretum* dem daraus entwickelten Verhältniss, nach welchem . . . seine Entscheidungen Regierungsverordnungen waren.'

We have left but short space in which to notice Dr. Mommsen's view of the position occupied by the senate under the principate. As is well known, he has described the imperial government rather as

a dyarchy than a monarchy, but until the publication of this volume the explanation and justification of the description have not been given. The last chapter in the work deals with the 'Sovereign Senate of the Principate.' Dr. Mommsen holds that the Augustan system was a compromise between the senatorial government as constituted by Sulla on the one hand and the autocracy of the Caesarian dictatorship on the other. On the one hand the magistracy, so far as it can be said to be represented by the princeps, is once more completely emancipated from senatorial control: on the other the sovereignty of the citizen-body is step by step transferred from the comitia to the senate, a process which received its completion under Tiberius. That practically the senate was little more than an instrument in the hands of the princeps, and never a real check upon his autocracy, Dr. Mommsen does not deny, and indeed this is involved in the use of the term principate as a description of the *régime*. This formal sovereignty was shared between that body, and the foremost citizen, but it received its name from the stronger element. The following are the principal points in which Dr. Mommsen discerns the sovereignty of the senate. (1) The functions of the comitia as regards elections and legislation are transferred to the senate, and the foremost place, which had previously of right belonged to the people, is now assumed by that body the regular formula being 'senatus populusque Romanus.' 'The populus and respublica have become ideal notions, for which the real expression and the practical form is the senate.' (2) In all cases of interregnum senatorial government has the right to step into the gap, and so while the position of the senate is legitimate and permanent, that

of the emperor is a magistracy, standing indeed but extraordinary, and one which is not of necessity self-renewed. (3) The ultimate courts of appeal in criminal cases, that of the consul and senate and that of the emperor, are unmistakable instances of concurrent sovereignty. (4) The administration of the empire is to a certain extent shared between senate and princeps, as is shown in the division of the provinces in B.C. 27, in the assignment of Italian administration to the senate, with ever-widening exceptions it is true in favour of the emperor, and in the distinction between aerarium and fiscus, the former of which was at first, and probably till Nero formally at least, in the hands of the senate. (5) While the emperor reserved the gold and silver coinage as his own prerogative, the copper coinage was for a considerable period handed over to the senate, a step which, as has already been pointed out in the second volume (p. 985), involved a very real limitation on the power of the princeps, since under the conditions of the Roman system the disposal of the copper coinage involved the possibility of putting into circulation an almost unlimited amount of credit-money. There are many other points in connection with the senate which have fresh light thrown upon them in this volume, or which are for the first time brought into clear relationship with the principles of the Roman Constitution. It would be an interesting task to go through the article on the senate in Smith's *Dictionary of Antiquities*, correcting it in the light of Mommsen's exposition. Nothing could show in a more striking light the advance which has been made since the publication of that now somewhat antiquated book, in exactitude, insight, and systematic work.

E. G. HARDY.

Beiträge zur Landes- und Volkskunde von Elsass-Lothringen. Die Alemannenschlacht vor Strassburg 357 A.D. Von W. WIEGAND. 1 Mk.

THE victory of Julian over the Alemanni in 357 was memorable not so much for what it effected as for what it failed to effect. It revived for the moment the prestige of the Romans in Gaul, but it was powerless to prevent the Germanisation of Elsass, which indeed dates from just this period. Associated thus closely with the national fate of Elsass, a topographical examination of the battle finds an appropriate place in a series of contributions to the local history and literature of Elsass-Lothringen. In spite of the unusually detailed accounts given by Ammianus and Libanius, the attempts hitherto made to localise the scene of the conflict have been unsatisfactory. F. Dahn

indeed in his elaborate discussion gives a purely imaginary picture of the battle based in no way on the nature of the ground. Hitherto the battle-field has usually been placed in the plain east of the range of the Hausberge. A consideration of the Roman line of march however shows that it must be put much to the south-west of this. Starting therefore from the two data that Julian marched from Zabern-Elsass against the barbarians encamped at Strassburg, Wiegand assumes that he took the direct military road, along which according to the Antonine Itinerary the distance was fourteen Gallic leugae, a measurement exactly confirmed by Ammianus (xvi. 12, 8). This road may be traced from about six kils. from Zabern to within about the same distance of Strassburg, both by visible signs and also by such names as *Hohe Strasse*, *Allstrass*, *Kaiser-strasse*, found in

old local records along the line. Running between the villages of Kleingöft and Wolschheim to the east slope of the Schälberg, and then to the south-east past Zeinheim, it mounts the plateau above Winzenheim, whence it descends near Küttolsheim to a more undulating tract, and passing Hürtigheim joins the road from Ittenheim to Strassburg. Turning to the contemporary account of the battle, Wiegand fixes on the plateau above Küttolsheim as the spot on which Julian halted and addressed his army. This is sixteen kils. on from Zabern, a distance which the army might naturally have reached by noon, and when once it had descended this plateau it would become visible to the enemy, and therefore this was the natural spot in which to make a final decision. The enemy's pickets were posted on a hill 'molliter editum . . . et a supercilis Rheni haud longo intervallo distantem.' This Wiegand takes to be the height of Hürtigheim. To this then the Romans advanced, and found the Alemanni awaiting them. The latter occupied the heights on each side of the Roman road, with their right stretching towards Oberhausbergen, and their left towards Ittenheim. This exactly fits the details given by Ammianus and Libanius. The cavalry was according to both on the Roman right, and the gently sloping ground towards Ittenheim is eminently suited to horsemen. On the other wing the Alemanni formed an ambush *ὁρ' ὄχρησ' περὶ ὄρησιν*. The clue to these words is no doubt to be found in the fact that, as Schweighauser and De Morlet show, an aqueduct supplying Strassburg ran along the side of the Roman road mostly underground, but crossing the streamlet Musau on an arch. This fixes the right wing of the Alemanni. The only objection to this view is the distance of the battle from the Rhine. Ammianus speaks of the river as 'barbarorum terga jam perstringentis,' whereas it is twelve kils. away. To meet this difficulty Wiegand suggests that the Rhine has since then changed its course. This is perhaps far-fetched, and a simpler explanation is suggested by the word 'jam,' which serves to describe the vicinity of the river, not during the battle, but after the flight. In any case it is impossible to suppose that the Alemanni either took up a position in the Rhine valley, or that they opposed the Roman line from the flank. In the former case they would be in face of a strong Roman position in an unprotected plain and hampered by the river behind; in the latter they would have failed to cut off the Roman line of advance; in both they would have deliberately renounced a position suitable to all we know of German tactics. There are unfortunately few battles of which the known facts suffice for so thorough a treatment. Monographs similar to this on the victories of Agricola over Galgacus, or Suetonius Paulinus over Boadicea are impossible, but as a measure of the indebtedness of Alsatis to Herr Wiegand we may take the extreme delight with which we should see as much light thrown on our own early battle-fields.

E. G. HARDY.

In a previous number of the *Classical Review* (vol. ii. pp. 82, 83) we noticed the first part of Dr. Lolling's *Hellenische Landeskunde und Topographie* which appeared in Dr. Iwan Müller's *Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*. The remainder of that work has now been published, and contains an account of the topography of Athens, compiled from the point of view of a classical scholar. It is an excellent piece of work, being clear and systematic, and based on a thorough study of the best sources of

information on the subject. Dr. Lolling follows the now familiar method of taking Pausanias as his guide in describing the noteworthy objects in the city; and, in order to render his delineation more clear, he has relegated the discussion of disputed points, as well as the citation of authorities, to the notes, which, except in the part relating to the Acropolis, occupy a greater space than the text itself. We notice that he regards the 'Theseium' as having been a temple of Hephaestus; on the other hand, as regards the site of the Pnyx, he takes the view which has been generally accepted since Chandler's time, not that propounded by Welcker and maintained by Ernst Curtius. It is to be regretted that in the account of the buildings of the Acropolis and the literature connected with them, so important a work as Penrose's *Principles of Athenian Architecture*, which laid the groundwork for the subsequent study of the subject, should be left unnoticed.

H. F. T.

THE same number of Dr. Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*, in which Dr. Lolling's treatise is concluded, contains also a valuable sketch of the geography of Italy and the provinces of the Roman empire by Dr. Jung ('Geographie von Italien und den römischen Provinzen,' von Dr. Julius Jung). Italy, it must be admitted, has fared rather badly in respect of the space which has been allotted to it, and the physical geography of that country, in particular, seems to us to have been rather scantily treated. We fail to find any general account of the mountain-ranges and rivers that intersect the area, and of the harbours and other determining features. For instance, though the Aufidus is mentioned in connection with Apulia, there is no description of its course, notwithstanding that it is distinguished among the rivers of Italy by its running almost across the whole breadth of the peninsula. There is also a deficiency of light and shade in the treatment of places, those which possess great historical or topographical interest being dismissed with as brief a notice as the most insignificant. The Vallis Ampsancti, with its sulphureous lake, which is famous both on account of its remarkable position and of the lines in which Virgil has depicted it:

locus Italiae medio sub montibus altis,
nobilis et fama multis memoratus in oris—

has surely a right to complain of being described as 'die Höhle Ampsanctus, aus welcher erstickende Dämpfe quollen.' So, too, a point of so great interest as the pass by which Hannibal crossed the Alps should hardly have been dismissed in a single sentence. For all this, the account which is here given of the separate districts of Italy is careful and accurate. But the really valuable part of this treatise is that which relates to the provinces; and it was probably in consequence of the typography of these being less familiar and presenting a great number of disputed questions that Dr. Jung has devoted especial attention to it. The ethnography also of the various peoples of the Roman world has been elaborately dealt with, and forms a conspicuous feature in the work. Finally, the bibliographical notices, which are appended to each section, are most serviceable, since they give a summary of the best authorities and sources of information both on general and special points, including inscriptions and coins, together with a critical estimate of their merits.

H. F. T.

Athènes et ses Environs. Paris: Hachette, 1888.
12 frcs.

THIS is the title of the first part, now issued separately, of a new *Guide-Joanne* for Greece. The original of this was embodied in the *Itinéraire de l'Orient* of the late Dr. Émile Isambert—a book which, at the time of its appearance in 1873, was quite the best handbook for Greece and European Turkey, and for the latter of those two countries still continues to be so. The description of Greece which it contained was greatly enhanced in value by its giving the results, in many cases unpublished, of the investigations of members of the French School of Athens; but subsequent explorations have added so considerably to our knowledge of the archaeology of the country, that a new edition of the book has long been required. The work of re-editing the account of Athens and Attica has now been intrusted to M. Haussoullier, who both from his intimate acquaintance with the country and his careful study of the subject is excellently qualified for the task; and this he has accomplished with great thoroughness, so that this part of the book has been re-written almost throughout. The objects of greatest interest in the museums are carefully catalogued, and the latest discoveries are noticed, such as the archaic statues, which were found in 1886 in the neighbourhood of the Erechtheum. The excavations at Eleusis are also described, and a plan of the sacred precincts at that place is appended. In respect of certain points in the topography of Athens a different view is now adopted from what we find in the previous edition. Thus, whereas Isambert adhered, at least pending the discovery of further evidence by means of excavation, to the old view, that the earlier Agora was situated in the space between the Acropolis, the Areopagus, and the Pnyx, M. Haussoullier agrees with those who assign to it the same position with the later Agora, to the north of the Areopagus. In the Introduction, though there is no sketch of the history of Greek art, like the admirable one of Kekulé in Baedeker's *Griechenland*, yet the reader will find a clearly written outline of the elements of Greek architecture, comprised in eight pages. The vocabulary of Modern Greek words and phrases, also, is sensible and well-chosen. We cannot speak so favourably of the information about the routes by which Greece may be reached from western Europe. In respect of the route by sea from Marseilles we are told that some of the Messageries steamers go by way of Naples, and a notice of objects worth visiting in that city is accordingly appended; whereas the boats of that company have for some time past ceased to touch there, as the editor might have discovered, if he had consulted the notices of steamers prefixed to the whole work. Again, some travellers at the present day may prefer to reach Greece by way of Constantinople or Salonica; but in this book, not only is there no intimation of a through route from Paris to those cities, but in the sketch-map of southern Europe, which accompanies it, the railways which lead to them are marked as unfinished.

H. F. TOZER.

Quaestionum Laconicarum Capita Duo. Diss.
Inaug. Phil. L. WEBER. Göttingen. 1887.

THE first chapter of this dissertation contains a careful investigation into the sources of the collection of excerpts which appears in Plutarch's works with the title τὰ παλαιὰ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ἐπιτηδεύματα (*Instituta Laconica*). The conclusion is that the principal part is drawn from Plutarch's *Life of Lycurgus*, while the rest is to be referred to some work περὶ πολιτείας

Λακεδαιμονίων, the writer of which used among other authorities at any rate Herodotus, Xenophon, and Aristotle. The *Instituta* were probably compiled by the same hand as the *Apophthegmata Laconica*, which precede the *Instituta* in the MSS., and are also extracted chiefly from Plutarch's *Lives*. The date assigned to the compilation is about the middle of the second century A.D.

One contention of the first chapter is certainly right. When at least fourteen articles of the *Instituta*, apart from a few necessary changes and additions, are found to coincide word for word with portions of the *Life of Lycurgus*, it seems incredible that any one should ever have explained this identity by the hypothesis of a third unknown work which Plutarch, as well as the author of the *Instituta*, faithfully transcribed. And yet Herr Weber regards this as the prevalent opinion in Germany ('regnat adhuc quantum uideo opinio,' p. 2), which it is his business to refute. But not all the articles of the *Instituta* can be shown to be excerpts from Plutarch's works as we possess them, and Herr Weber goes on to argue that since the person who copied out verbatim fragments of Plutarch was plainly neither intelligent nor learned, the simplest theory is to suppose that he had one other authority whom he treated like Plutarch. This may be so, but it is impossible to prove that the collection was vamped up out of two books only, and it is hardly worth while to frame conjectures about the method of procedure of so contemptible an epitomator. The point of interest and importance is to determine, if possible, the ultimate authority of those statements which are not taken from the *Life of Lycurgus*. Herr Weber thinks that in c. 10 of the *Instituta* he can detect traces of Herodotus (2, 80), but as there is no close verbal coincidence, and as the practices described are a commonplace of eulogists of Sparta, it is difficult to perceive the grounds of his confidence. On the other hand there are traces of the phraseology as well as of the statements of the *Respublica Laedaemoniorum* of Xenophon (c. 10, c. 11, c. 13, c. 23): I do not see however why c. 7 should be referred to Xen. (*op. cit.* 2, 13) in particular. There are also curious verbal resemblances with a fragment which the scholiast on Aristoph. *Ach.* 320 ascribes to Aristotle, and with two passages of the pseudo-Heraclides. Herr Weber cites Heraclides from an antiquated text: a glance at Schneidewin's edition (p. 7, l. 7, 11) or, better still, at Rose's transcript of the Vatican MS., the archetype of the MSS. used by Schneidewin, would have helped to strengthen the argument. There remain fourteen sections which convey statements peculiar to the anonymous compiler and for which we have no other authority. The information given in these is neither very important nor trustworthy, for where we can check the scribe we find too often his utterances misleading. For all else save these sections writers on Sparta must quote not the *Instituta*, but the authorities on which the *Instituta* rest.

The second chapter is headed 'De Lexicographorum Glossis Ad Res Laconicas Pertinentibus.' The author first attempts to determine the value for the student of Spartan antiquities of Hesychius as compared with the other lexica. His results are that, where a comparison is possible, Hesychius proves more trustworthy for religion and ritual than the *Etymologicum Magnum* or any other lexicon, except *Lex. Seg. V.* in Bekker's *Anecdota Graeca*, but inferior to the other lexica and the scholiasts in the notes on political institutions. The practical use however of this conclusion is not very great, since glosses of both kinds are very scanty in the other lexica, very numerous in Hesychius. The other thesis maintained is

that the glosses in Hesychius relating to sacrifices, festivals, epithets of gods, etc., are one and all derived from a single work, a treatise *περί τῶν ἐν Λακεδαιμονίᾳ θυσίων*, written by a certain Sosibius, who lived at the court of Ptolemy II. This suggestion was first thrown out by C. Müller (*F. H. G.* II. p. 628), but proof is out of the question. Sosibius is cited in Hesychius as an authority in one article; a few other articles for which no authority is given coincide in substance with passages in Athenaeus to which the name of Sosibius is attached. This state of things justifies the modest inference that some other glosses in Hesychius may convey the learning of Sosibius. But this will not content the 'Quellenforscher.' Herr Weber seeks to demonstrate—unsuccessfully in my opinion—that the dialect of these glosses and the occasional use of the present tense point to a work composed not later than the end of the third century B.C., and proceeds to construct a series of unprovable hypotheses, that the glosses on religious matters are separable from those explanatory of dialect and political institutions; that these *glossae sacrae* are all to be traced to Sosibius' work *περί τῶν θυσίων*, and not to his commentary on Aelian; that the same work *περί τῶν θυσίων* was one source of a hypothetical compendium dealing with Sparta only; that this compendium was embodied in an abbreviated and corrupted form in the more comprehensive lexica, and has come down to the present time embedded in the pages of Hesychius. A piece of work far more useful than these speculations is the collection of seventy-six *glossae sacrae* given at the end of the book: the lemmata, it is true, are often corrupt, the explanations miserably meagre, but they are all we have and are very precious. If Herr Weber would get together and purify all the glosses in Hesychius bearing on things Spartan, he would do a real service to the student of Greek antiquities.

W. WYSE.

Die Neronische Christenverfolgung. Eine kritische Untersuchung zur Geschichte der ältesten Kirche von Lic. Dr. C. FRANKLIN ARNOLD. Leipzig: Richter (London: Trübner) 1888. 4 Mk.

DR. ARNOLD has made the passage in *Annals* xv. 44, which contains the only reference to Christianity found in the existing books of Tacitus, the subject of a special inquiry. He examines first the text of that passage (p. 4-11). The text of the whole of *Annals* xi.-xvi. is based on one MS. which was written in Monte Cassino between 1053 and 1087 and which was added by Cosimo to the library he had founded in 1444. This MS. is the Mediceus II. It is written in Longobardian characters. A facsimile of the passage in chapt. 44 is appended; and one expression only appears open to doubt. In the description of 'the live torches' in Nero's garden the Christians are said to be condemned 'ut ferarum tergis coniecti laniati canum interit aut crucibus affixi aut flammandi atque ubi defecisset dies in usum nocturni luminis urerentur.' The Codex Agricola has *flammati*. The Chronicle of Sulpicius Severus (completed 403), which has here evidently copied the *Annals*, offers the reading *flamma usti*. Both these variations however as well as the suggestion of Nipperdey, that the words may be an interpolation inserted into the text after the Septimian or Decian persecution, and that they speak of punishments inflicted on Christians at a much later date, are discarded by the author. Dr. Arnold proposes to alter the text of the Mediceus into 'aut crucibus affixi sunt flammandi atque, ubi defecisset dies etc.' He maintains (p. 11-30) that neither the context in which chapt. 44 stands, nor its diction, which possesses all the peculiarities of Tacitus' style, give any reason

to suppose that any alteration or addition has been made to the original text.

The Roman historian did not consider the Christians guilty of having caused the fire, which raged from the 19th to 24th July 64, and laid waste more than half of the city. His own estimate of them however he shows sufficiently when he introduces them as 'quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat.' The meaning of *flagitia* in this phrase is rendered clear by *Germania* (chapt. xii.) where we are told the Germans punished treason with hanging, cowardice and adultery with drowning, 'tāquam scelera ostendi oporteat, dum puniuntur, flagitia abscondi,' and from Plin. x. 96, 'nomen ipsum si flagitiis careat, an flagitia coherentia nomini puniantur.' As Pliny remarks especially that the food of which the Christians partook at their *agapes* was 'promiscuus tamen et innoxius,' there can be no doubt that he is alluding to the Thyestean banquets and Oedipodean marriages (referred to in the dialogue of Minucius Felix, chapt. 9), which were supposed to have taken place at their nocturnal assemblies. That Tacitus makes indirectly the same allegations against the Christians, is shown from the manner, in which he describes the early spread of Christianity. That pernicious superstition, he says, found its way to the city of Rome, 'quo cuncta undique atrocitas aut pudenda confluent celebranturque. Celebrare means here to imitate, as in *Histor.* ii. 49, where after the account of Otho's suicide we read: 'ac postea Bedriaci Placentiae alisque in castris celebratum id genus mortis.' And *atrox* is in an especial sense applied to deeds of blood: *Ann.* i. 45 and iv. 11. *Atrocitas* were the banquets, *pudenda* the marriages, of which the Christians were accused. These accusations rendered them liable to the punishments which the Lex Cornelia (Sullae) de sicariis et veneficiis directed against murder and magical arts as well as against incendiarism. Persons found guilty of the first two of these crimes were condemned (Paulus lib. v. *Sententiae ad L. Corn.*) 'summo supplicio adfici, id est bestiis obijci aut crucibus suffigi—ipsi autem magi vivi exuruntur.' These are the forms of punishment which according to Tacitus were inflicted on the people 'convicted of hatred of the human race.' The conviction was secured by torture (p. 64). Dr. Arnold does not agree with Nipperdey and Draeger, that the first of those who were accused confessed their religion. The sentence 'primum corrupti qui futebantur' requires as subordinate clause, he maintains, not 'se Christianos esse,' but 'se incendium fecisse,' or simply 'incendium.'

He next discusses (chapt. iii. p. 30 sq.) the arguments with which Gibbon and lately H. Schiller (*Gesch. des röm. Reichs unter Nero*, p. 431) have impugned the accuracy of the account given in the *Annals*. Both historians agree that Tacitus was unable to distinguish between the Christians and the Jews, and that the persecution of which he speaks and which he greatly exaggerates was directed against the latter. Schiller's opinion is, that the wooden booths, inhabited by Oriental traders, which surrounded the Circus Maximus, formed a ghetto, in which Jews and Christians lived promiscuously, worshipping in the same synagogues, observing the same feast days and keeping the same laws. It was in these booths that the fire broke out on July 19. The suspicion as well as the resentment of the people was directed against the 'Orientals.' To this popular feeling Nero, whose 'heart was ever open to the sorrows and pleasures of the multitude,' gave way. Schiller's opinion appears to be without foundation. According to Schürer (*Die Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom*, p. 16), the Jews did not inhabit a separate quarter: they were scattered over the city. Hebrew families

were found in the fourteenth district beyond the Tiber, which was not touched by the fire, as well as on the Campus Martius and the Subura, that is in the ninth and fourth districts. But the conflagration first broke out in that part of the town which lies between Mons Caelius and the Palatine, that is between the eleventh and second districts. The Jews, so far from being made by Nero the victims of unjust accusations, possessed considerable influence with the emperor, through Poppaea—one of their proselytes—the actor Aliturus and many other Orientals, who had access to his court. They, 'the real persecutors of Christianity before the destruction of Jerusalem,' may have, as Renan thinks (*Orig. du Christ.* iv. p. 156), suggested to Nero the first idea of offering the Christians as a sacrifice to the anger which the fire had created. The main question however is whether Tacitus, like Pliny and Suetonius, knew Christianity to be a 'superstitio' distinct and different from that of the Jews. The author points out that the passage in the 44th chapt. of the *Annals* is undoubtedly the first in which the historian speaks of the 'auctor nominis ejus, Christus', but possibly not the last. The lost portion of the *Hist.* which contained the destruction of Jerusalem has formed the source, on which Sulpicius Severus drew in his record of that event. His chronicle shows here, ii, 30, 6 (according to J. Bernays, *Ueber die Chronik des Sulp. Sev.* Berlin, 1861, p. 57), the same unmistakable traces of Tacitean diction, which it displays in the passage quoted above. The chronicler states that in the council of war in Titus' camp one of the members expressed his opinion in favour of the destruction of the temple on the ground that not merely the Jewish but also the Christian superstition would thereby be destroyed. 'Both these errors, although contrary to one another,' he said, 'had sprung from the same authors; the Christians had come from the Jews. If the root were once destroyed, the plant would soon wither.'

These words appear to be in exact keeping with the knowledge which Tacitus, to judge from his *Annals*, possessed of the new religion. He was at the same time acquainted with the Jewish system; he had no doubt read Josephus (comp. *Hist.* v. 13 with *Jos. Bell.* J. vii. 5, 4), and he knew the conditions on which proselytes were admitted into the Hebrew community (*Hist.* v. 5). There can hardly be any doubt that Tacitus clearly distinguished between the two religions, and that he did not commit the error which Gibbon and Schiller have ascribed to him and which, if true, would contain a serious reflection on his character as a historian.

In the remaining chapters (V, VII-IX) Dr. Arnold discusses the various references to the Neronian persecution found in later writers, and he describes the different shapes which the record of that event gradually assumed in ecclesiastical tradition.

In the summary thus far given we have been obliged to confine ourselves to certain points. It is to one only of these that we venture to take exception. In quoting (p. 58) Renan's remark, that Jews who had 'secret entrées' at Nero's court had really instigated the persecution, Dr. Arnold justly says that so grave an accusation should not have been brought without sufficient historical evidence against the Hebrew community in Rome. But the evidence which he adduces (p. 62) only shows that Jews may have, as the Christian writers of the second century averred, circulated false rumours about Christians, but not that they abused their influence in the manner indicated. And in the passage (I Clem. Rom. V. VI.) where Clement warns the Corinthian congregation against that jealousy and envy, the fruitful source of calamities as recorded in the Old Testament, and the cause in his

own age of the death of the two great Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul as well as of many saintly women, he evidently refers to divisions which must have taken place within the Christian community, and which found vent perhaps in denunciations.

Altogether Dr. Arnold's treatise appears to us valuable as bringing together all the references found in ancient writers bearing on *Annals*, xv. 44, and throwing light on a passage which is of great importance to the history of early Christianity.

CHARLES MERK.

Die Stellung Augustins in der Publicistik des Gregorianischen Kirchenstreits, von CARL MERT, Privatdozent der Theologie in der Universität Göttingen. Leipzig, 1888. Pp. 113. 3 Mk.

THIS essay starts from the 'indisputable fact' that Luther and Augustine are the two men who have exercised the most influence upon the development of the Christian Church. A scientific investigation of this influence in the case of Augustine is still a desideratum, and the essay is a contribution towards supplying the want. It consists mainly of an analysis of the literature of the second half of the eleventh century, with a view to estimating the influence which the writings of Augustine had upon both sides in the great controversy between the Papacy and the Empire. The analysis is worked out in a very thorough way, and the results are tabulated in a convenient summary. This summary shows a very large number of quotations from St. Augustine's works, and from a great variety of them; quotations from his *Epistles*, *Sermons*, the *City of God*, the *Tractates on St. John*, and the treatise on *Baptism against the Donatists*, being specially abundant. But, of 371 citations, only 222 are given with a correct reference to the source, 29 being given with a false reference, and 120 with no reference at all. Not only the same treatises, but the same passages, are frequently quoted. This fact, coupled with the frequent absence of references, tends to show that *collections of extracts* were in use, and that the controversialists rarely drew directly from the works of Augustine. Great as was the desire of both parties to have him as an authority for their own side, few of them were at the pains to study him for themselves. The only Father who is quoted as frequently as Augustine is Gregory the Great. But that does not prove that his influence was equal to that of Augustine; for Gregory was much more of an ecclesiastical politician than Augustine, and therefore frequently treats of the subjects so hotly debated in the eleventh century, where Augustine is entirely silent about them.

A. PLUMMER.

A Collation of the Athos Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas. Together with an Introduction by SPYR. P. LAMBROS, Ph.D., Professor of History in the University of Athens. Translated and Edited with a Preface and Appendices by J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, M.A., Fellow and Dean of Christ's College, Cambridge: at the University Press, 1888. 8vo. Pp. xii. 36. 3s. 6d.

THIS book adds another to the remarkable list of documents illustrative of early Christian history discovered within the last few years. Its history partakes of the character of romance. Some of our readers may require to be reminded that the book called the *Shepherd of Hermas* is a work of the early part of the second century, and contains a series of visions followed by a series of 'Mandata,' or preceptive discourses, and a series of similitudes.

Until about thirty years ago the *Shepherd* was known only in a Latin version. A second Latin version from a Palatine MS. in the Vatican was edited in 1857, and three years later an Ethiopic version was published. But a short time previously, viz., in 1855, what purported to be the original Greek text of almost the entire work was offered to and purchased by the University of Leipsic. The vendor was Constantine Simonides. To our younger readers the name Simonides carries no associations except those connected with the poet of Ceos. But to us of an older generation it calls up the vision of a dignified and imposing gentleman with a long beard and plausible manners, having also great knowledge of old manuscripts, and good store of interesting documents for sale, including such things as biblical papyri of the first century, some books of Homer's *Iliad*, written B.C. 87 and boustrophedon, the whole history of which moreover was said to be traceable.

He had also palimpsests, of which that of Uranius was the most famous, as it possessed the singular peculiarity that the obscure writing, or what professed to be the original, appeared to be written over, not under, the blacker text. It was this MS. that was made the ground of a criminal charge against him, as he was prosecuted in Germany on the double charge of having stolen the MS. from some library unknown, and of having forged it. We are not concerned to defend the logic of this double accusation. Certain it is, however, that some of his MSS. were genuine, but that others, and those the most interesting in their alleged character, were forged. Considering the extent and variety of his work, Simonides is perhaps the most remarkable forger on record.

At the time that he sold the copy of the *Shepherd* to the University of Leipsic, his character was not as well known as it soon after became. The copy consisted of three leaves of a paper MS. from Mount Athos in a fourteenth century hand, and a copy of six other leaves of the same MS. which he had not been able to bring away with him. The text was immediately edited by Ånger and Dindorf, who promised to add a volume of critical materials. This volume, however, never appeared, and for a good reason. Simonides was arrested on the charge above alluded to, of forging or stealing the MS. of Uranius. His papers were seized (a circumstance of which his friends made great complaint), and amongst them was found another copy of the *Hermas* MS., very different from that which he had sold to the Leipsic Library. This Simonides accounted for by saying that they were made from different MSS., and Hilgenfeld has lately expressed his substantial agreement with this. But the general opinion has been that the second copy (that found by the police) was a genuine copy of the Athos MS., the other having been constructed from it by alterations due to Simonides himself. In fact, these alterations actually appeared on the second copy, some in pencil and some in ink. It may be asked what was his object in thus falsifying the text when he possessed a correct copy. The answer is found in the fact that he also produced what professed to be a palimpsest of the *Shepherd*. It was doubtless with a view to the construction of this palimpsest that he kept back his real Athos copy, so that it might present a different and what might appear to be a more ancient form of text.

Another Greek text of part of the *Shepherd* was discovered by Tischendorf in the Sinaitic MS. Although this was only a fragment, yet by its substantial agreement with the Athos MS. it was sufficient to prove that the latter was actually the original Greek, not, as Tischendorf had himself suggested, a middle age translation from some Latin version (different

however from both those above mentioned). Nevertheless the bad faith of Simonides made it impossible to place full reliance on his copy.

Now comes the discovery alluded to, namely that of the original of Simonides' apographon in the monastery of St. Gregory on Mount Athos. The discovery was made by Dr. Spyridon P. Lambros, who was engaged in cataloguing the MSS. of the Athos libraries. The exact correspondence of the Leipsic leaves with those in Athos leaves no room for doubt that they are part of the same MS., even if we had not the confirmation given by the tradition of the monks that the three missing leaves were abstracted by 'Minas Minoides,' who also they say made certain annotations now appearing on the margin of the MS.

Professor Lambros' collation¹ of the MS. has proved that Simonides' copy was not only inexact, but even unscrupulous, as indeed his other performances would lead us to expect. A man accustomed to alter and emend MSS. cannot be trusted to copy correctly. An eminent scholar or a former generation, who was employed to read the proof-sheets of an edition of Demosthenes, could not refrain from introducing his own conjectures into the text without giving any hint that he had done so. Simonides did the same, though in a coarser manner. Where there were gaps in the MS. he did not always mark them, but filled them up. So that we may say that now for the first time we have the Greek text of the *Shepherd* with the exception of the last leaf, which must have been lost when Simonides discovered the codex, otherwise he would have copied it or else carried it off.

But here we meet his handiwork again. He was not to be defeated by a difficulty so trifling as the loss of a leaf of the Greek text. Four years after the sale of his corrupted copy to the Leipsic library he printed along with other tracts what purported to be the missing Greek conclusion. As by that time his character was irretrievably lost, no one would look at his publication. But lately this document has been reproduced by Draeseke, who regards it as genuine, and Hilgenfeld, adopting this view, has taken the opportunity of publishing 'for the first time' a complete Greek text.²

Mr. Robinson's discussion appended to the present volume establishes beyond all doubt that this pretended conclusion is a paraphrase of the old Latin version. Fortunately we are able to compare with it a quotation of the original found in the Homilies of Antiochus, a monk of the seventh century. One passage may suffice to show how Simonides' work was done.

'Sin autem aliquid ex his dissipata invenerit (vulg. pecus aliquod ex talibus invenerit dissipatum) vae erit pastoribus; quodsi ipsi pastores dissipati 'reperi' (om. ed. vulg.) fuerint, quid respondebant ei pro

¹ It does not seem correct to say that the collation is 'with the text ascribed to the apographon of Simonides in the edition of Gebhardt and Harnack.' Where these scholars had the Sinaitic MS. before them, the collation is generally speaking with their text. This is important to notice, otherwise it might be supposed for example that the MS. reads in VII. III. 3, p. 36, 13, *πανούργος εἰ περὶ τὰς γραφάς* after *καὶ τὸ πρότερον*, or, immediately after, *ἐκζητήσεις* and *ἐυρήσεις* instead of *ἐκζητεῖς* and *ἐυρήσεις*, or on p. 38, 9, *διαφορὰν* for *ἔξοδον*. Or we might suppose that Simonides read in p. 2, 2, *πέπρακέν με ῥόδη τινί*, not *πεπρακέναι* *καὶ ὁδὸν τινα*, or again in 2, 4, *μετὰ χρόνον τινα λοουμένην*, and not *μετὰ χρόνον πολλοῦ ὀμλεῖν*.

² *Hermas Pastor. Graece integrum ambitu primum*. Edidit Adolphus Hilgenfeld. Lipsiae, 1887.

pecoribus 'his' (om. ed. vulg.)? Numquid dicent a pecore se vexatos? non credetur illis, incredibilis enim res est pastorem pati posse a pecore.

Antiochus has:

‘ἐὰν δὲ εὐρεθῇ τινα ἐξ αὐτῶν διαπεπτωκότα, οὐαὶ τοῖς ποιμήσιν ἔσται. ἐὰν δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ ποιμένες εὐρεθῶσιν διαπεπτωκότες, τί ἐροῦσιν τῷ δεσπότῃ τοῦ ποιμνίου; ὅτι ἀπὸ τῶν προβάτων διέπεσαν; οὐ πιστευθήσονται. ἀπιστον γὰρ πρῶγμ’ ἔστιν ποιμένα ὑπὸ προβάτων παθεῖν τι.’

Simonides gives us:

‘καὶ γὰρ εἰ πρόβατόν τι ἐκ τῆς ὄλης ποιμνὸς ἀποπλανηθῇ, λύπη ἔσεται τοῖς ποιμήσι μεγάλη. εἰ δὲ καὶ οἱ ποιμένες αὐτοὶ διασπαρῶσι, τίνα λόγον δώσουσιν οὗτοι τῷ κυρίῳ ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων; ἐροῦσιν ἕρα ὡς ὑπὸ τῶν προβάτων ἀπεβλήθησαν; ἀλλ’ οὐδέποτε πιστευθήσονται οὗτοι ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου τῶν ἀνθρώπων. ἀδύνατον γὰρ ἔστιν ὅλους τοὺς ποιμένας ἐκβληθῆναι τῆς μάνδρας ὑπὸ τῶν προβάτων, ἢ τι ἕτερον κακὸν παθεῖν αὐτοὺς ὑπ’ αὐτῶν.’

A moment's comparison will doubtless satisfy the critical reader that in the last quotation we have a translation from the Latin.

We may, after Mr. Robinson, note a few particulars.

1. The weak *λύπη μεγάλη* instead of *οὐαί*.
2. The form *ἔσεται*. An easy mistake for a modern Greek who never uses the future forms in conversation.
3. The absence of any word corresponding to 'reperit,' which is in the old Latin and represented in the Palatine Latin as well as in Antiochus, but is significantly absent from the editio vulgata.
4. The difficulty Simonides found in translating 'dissipari,' used both of the shepherds and the flock, as he missed the word *διασπαρῆναι*, which is also the original of 'vexari,' where the Latin translator saw that 'dissipari' would not be suitable. Simonides has three different words.
5. The repetition of the pronouns; a characteristic of modern language.
6. *ὅλους* for *πάντας*, a regular modern Greek use. Hilgenfeld emends, reading *ὅλους*.
7. *μάνδρα* twice occurring in this Simonides fragment, although not elsewhere in the *Shepherd*. The word is in use in modern Greek.

There is a second appendix dealing with Professor Rendel Harris' recent paper on *Hermas in Arcadia*.

T. K. ABBOTT.

Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen. Erster Band, Drittes Heft. De vi atque indole rhythmorum quid veteres iudicaverint. Scripsit GEORGIUS AMSEL. Breslau. 1887.

THE author of this treatise has in about a hundred pages for the first time collected and arranged the various passages in Greek and Latin writers bearing on the nature and effect of rhythm. It will be sufficient to give a short analysis of the subjects treated. After an introduction on the sources from which the material is drawn, Book I. gives the statements of ancient authors on rhythm in general—its origin and nature, its application to dancing, poetry and oratory, the pleasure derived from it, its connection with and effect upon character, its educational value, the impression produced by change of rhythm. Book II. deals with the different kinds of metre, the subjects being as follows: the effect produced by long and short syllables, or by feet composed of them, e.g. dactyls and spondees, and the fanciful analogies connected with different kinds of feet; the effect of

rising and falling rhythms, of catalexis, of the three genera of rhythms (i.e. those in which the two elements of the foot are in the relations of 2 : 2, 2 : 1, 3 : 2), and lastly of logaedics. Incidentally the meaning of some difficult passages is discussed, or new interpretations are suggested. Thus e.g. there is a detailed examination of Dionysius *De Comp. Verb.* c. 4, where Dionysius illustrates the importance of metrical form by showing how the effect of some lines in Homer would be spoilt by arranging the words in some other metre; and there is a lengthy, though inconclusive, discussion of an obscure passage in the *De Sublimitate* (c. 39), referring to the peculiar excellence of the rhythm in a famous sentence in the *De Corona*.

An Appendix contains contributions to the textual criticism of some Greek writers on music and metre, which have been communicated to Dr. Amsel by L. Cohn and W. Studemund. The most important are those which deal with Aristides Quintilianus and pseudo-Plutarch *De Musica*. They consist of accounts of MSS. and a number of various readings.

C. B. HEBERDEN.

Fragments of the Greek Comic Poets with renderings in English Verse, by F. A. PALEY, LL.D. Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 4s. 6d.

Is it pure accident, which has preserved for us so many plays of Aristophanes, while the poets of the middle and new comedies are only known to us in fragments? Dr. Paley may be supposed to have culled the choicest passages from Meineke's Collection, and however witty and pointed they may be, however well adapted for imitation by the Latin Comedians, this very neatness and elegance contrasts forcibly with the broad humour, which, like that of our own Shakspeare, reflects the grandeur as well as the coarseness of his age. When Dr. Paley complains in his preface that the Old Comedy 'had become an incentive to unrestrained vice,' he is unconsciously transferring to the Athenian population at the time of the Peloponnesian war the sentiments which nineteen centuries of Christianity have produced in the modern world. Aristophanes does not incite to vice, he is no preacher of immorality: he satirizes the infamous not with scathing moral reprobation, but with derision and contempt; if he ridicules Socrates it is because he forebodes a decay of public morals as the effect of the Socratic Scepticism: and he inveighs against the restless ambition and venality of the Demos as a conservative patriot, who had no sympathy with the statesman called by Dr. Paley in a note the G.O.M. of Athens.

The later comedians may 'rarely offend against decency,' but their imitators at Rome do not convince us of this fact, and at any rate they lived in a less strenuous age, and depicted a more frivolous society. When we come to analyse the contents of the present volume, the main point which strikes us is the inordinate appetite for fish which characterizes all members of the community. Eating and drinking are the staple subjects of the extracts, and the philosophy is of a cynical and Epicurean cast. There is one exception (perhaps two) to this general rule; for while Menander supplies a few finer touches, Philemon is by far the most attractive writer, judging from the fragments here presented: he is no mere retailer of commonplace witticisms; and there runs through his work a serious though not sententious vein of thoughtfulness.

Dr. Paley has adopted Meineke's text with few exceptions. He has made at least one good correction

in Anaxandrides (*Fr.* 53) where the fisherman's craft is said to be one.

ἔγουν' ἐπ' αὐτὰ τὰ στόματ' ἄριστον πύλας,

where the MSS. read ὕπ' αὐτὰ τὰ σωματ', which he translates :

'Tis that which opens wide the gate
To mouths which for a dinner wait.

On the other hand, a suggestion that for

ἄνδρες πάλαι ὀφθαλμοὶ τοιοῦτοι τινες,

perhaps a spurious line, we should read πολυφάγοι for ὀφθαλμοὶ leaves the metrical mistake untouched.

The translations which accompany the extracts must have been the composition of Horae Subsecivae. Dr. Paley is careful to guard himself in the preface against the assumption that he is a close translator, but occasionally he misses the point of the passage.

For instance Antiphanes (*Fr.* 20)

διὰ τὴν ἐπικαρπίαν γὰρ τῶν ἄδρῶν
ταῦτ' ἐσθλὸν τὰ φαῦλ' ἀνέχομαι,

the point being that from economical motives the speaker dines on immature meat, because the full-grown animal is more costly, is translated :

My diet thus I make on young and tender
Not from such flocks as after-profits render.

Again Antiphanes (*Fr.* 68)

A. σὺ δ' ἀγοράσεις ἡμῖν λαβόν,
Πίστ', ἀργύριον. Π. ἄλλως γὰρ οὐκ ἐπίσταμαι
χρηστῶς ἀγορεύειν

runs thus :

'Slave Trusty, take
This purse : provisions get and ready make.
Slave (*aside*). I'm no great hand at shopping,
but I'll try
On this occasion something nice to buy,'

but ἄλλως surely implies 'without money.' In Pherecrates *Fr.* 67 φάρμακον is translated 'poison' where it evidently means 'physic.'

Again Menander *Fr.* 670 :

νόμος φυλαχθεὶς οὐδὲν ἐστίν ἢ νόμος,
ὁ μὴ φυλαχθεὶς καὶ νόμος καὶ δῆμιος.

To say that law is *only* law is rash :

Break it, you'll find that it can ply the lash,

where the antithesis of the two lines is lost. The exigencies of rhyme do not excuse unlimited padding: e.g.

ξηρὰν ἔχουσα τὴν φάρυγγα becomes

My throat is dry,

My windpipe steamed : to spit I vainly try.

But it would be ungracious to find more fault with one who has now passed away from us. All scholars are deeply grateful to Dr. Paley for his labours in the field of Athenian Tragedy ; but humour does not seem to be his strong point. Where the extract takes a more serious tone, he is more successful.

Here is one from Diphilus (*Fr.* 86) :

There is no life that hath not many an ill,
Griefs, losses, cares, disease, new torments still,
From which death only, that physician blest,
Sets free the sufferer, and gives him rest.

The volume is well printed on good paper, and misprints are rare.

E. D. STONE.

The Laches of Plato, with Introduction and Notes by M. T. TATHAM, M.A., of Balliol College, Oxford. London : Macmillan & Co., 1888. 2s. 6d.

THIS edition is based on the Zurich text of 1851, and contains Introduction, Text, and Notes, with an Appendix on *ἀνδρεία* in Plato and Aristotle, and Indices, Greek and English—in all pp. xxiv. 99. The editor hopes 'that the book may be useful as an introduction to the study of Plato ; but it is not meant for the lower forms of a public school, or for those who have not already some acquaintance with other Greek authors.'

The introduction is clear but quite inadequate in 'an introduction to the study of Plato': there ought to be some account of the doctrines taught in the first stage of Platonism, and in particular the residuum of positive teaching in the Laches should be more precisely brought out, as is done by Bonitz in his admirable study of the dialogue (*Platonische Studien*, pp. 210—226). It is to be found as usual 'in den Sätzen, die unbestritten stehen bleiben' (Bonitz, p. 216). There are also one or two inaccuracies of detail throughout the Introduction : thus it is clear from *Tim.* 20 E (ἦν μὲν οὖν οἰκεῖος καὶ σφῶδρα φίλος ἡμῖν Δρωπίδου τοῦ προπάππου) that Solon was not brother but only an intimate friend of Dropides : 428 moreover and not 429 is the probable date of Plato's birth (Christ in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*, vol. vii. p. 328). Lastly, why is the Lysis supposed 'to be the earliest of the dialogues' (p. xv.)?

As regards the text, it is high time that Schanz's admirable collation should supersede the antiquated Zurich edition. In the following places Schanz is manifestly right : 180 D τᾶλλα δόξα (so T : Tatham δόπου with B) βούλει ξεῖν συνδιατρίβειν : 188 D ἡρμοσμένος οὐ λύραν κ.τ.λ.—ἀλλὰ τῷ ὄντι (ἦν ἡρμοσμένος οὐ) αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ τὸν Βίον, where Tatham brackets οὐ only, without giving any note, but the preceding ἡρμοσμένος οὐ is responsible for the mistake : 192 E πλέον ἐκτῆσται, where Tatham following Rutherford (*New Phrygia* p. 408) reads πλεονεκτῆσται, in itself a dubious form, since ἐξομαι and ἔξω have different meanings and the future perfect is moreover strictly to the point here : translate 'knowing that if he spends, he will (then) have got more' : 195 C ἢ τὸ ὑγιαίνειν εἰπεῖν [οἶόν τε] καὶ νοσῶδες—here Tatham retains the text in spite of the perverse τε : for my own part I should read οἶόν τι (sc. ἐστίν) : 197 B καὶ γὰρ μοι δοκεῖ το ὅδε μὴ ἡσθῆσθαι ὅτι—the MSS. reading is here οὐδὲ μὴ, a barbarism which Tatham retains, although δοκεῖ οὐδὲ for οὐδὲ δοκεῖς is itself sufficiently strange (cf. οὐ δοκῶ, οὐ φημι, etc.), and 200 E τί οὖν ἂν τις ἡμῶν τίνα (Tatham τίνα, against BT) προαιροῖτο : this reading alone will make the question and the answer correspond. On the other hand, I agree with Tatham when he suggests that ὥσπερ γένει in 187 E and ὅτι ἐγὼ αἴτιος in 191 C are marginal glosses : I wish he had banished them from the text. In more than one passage a reading different from the MSS. is adopted without remark : but in all such cases as I believe, and certainly in those cases where a point of syntax is involved (as in 187 E where πρὶν ἂν ἐμπέσῃ is read for πρὶν ἐμπέσῃ of BT) it would have been well to give a note.

The notes are for the most part correct, as far as they go : but more attention should (I think) have been given to the subject-matter of the dialogue : thus no notice is taken of the latent theory of ὁρῆ δόξα and δημοτικὴ ἀρετὴ in 185 E. The note on καλὸν τε καὶ ἀγαθὸν in 186 C says nothing as to the political sense of this term. Slight inaccuracies I have noticed here and there, as in 183 C, where αὐτόθες = 'from this very

point' (*ἐξ αὐτοῦ τούτου*), explained presently by the introductory γάρ. In 186 D there is no 'irregular redundancy': a colon should be printed after *Ἀνακόλουθον*: 'To say that *Anacoluthon* is *unfortunately* frequent in Plato' is to censure not Plato, but the use of the dialogue as a literary form. Plato's dialogues were intended as an image of spoken speech (Phaedr. 276 B); and therefore anacoluthon is not only justifiable, but even necessary. In the note on 191 B it is said that Plato's account of the Lacedaemonian stratagem at Plataea is inconsistent with Herod. ix. 61 ff. Strictly understood, it is; but I incline to think that Plato had in his mind the retreat of Pausanias described in ix. 56 ff., in consequence of which the Persians were drawn from their position. I am glad to see that Tatham keeps the MSS. reading in 201 A οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔκφορος λόγος (Schanz λόγος): but (as he himself allows) the clause cannot be translated 'my words will not be reported to anybody outside.' With Schanz's text the meaning is clear, if we may take *ἔκφορος* as transitive (in defiance of Blaydes' somewhat hasty remark on Arist. *Eccles.* 472); but it does not suit the context, or Socrates' teaching generally, for he never was ashamed to seek a teacher, and not only *μῆτε χρημάτων φειδόμενος* infra, but especially *εἰ δέ τις ἡμῶν καταγέλῃσεται κ.τ.λ.* in B show clearly that in this particular instance he wished to make no secret of his ignorance. I take the words as equivalent to οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔκφορος (λόγος δ) λόγος, where *ἔκφορος* = *ἐκφύων* i.e. *φύων ἔξω τῶν πραγμάτων*, *ἔξω τῶν ἐλαῶν*, irrelevant because carrying us too far: a λόγος which leads us (cf. *ὅπη ἂν ὁ λόγος ὥσπερ πνεῦμα φέρῃ*) may sometimes lead us too far. I have noticed misprints (chiefly in the Greek) on pp. xv., 52, 59, 65, 72 (ter), 73, 82, 87 (bis): but there are more besides.

J. ADAM.

Cicero De Officiis III. H. A. HOLDEN. Seventh Edition. 1888. 9s.

THIS separate issue of the third Book differs from the last complete edition in the Introduction, which has been entirely rewritten and now includes the substance of the *Einleitung* to C. F. W. Müller's annotated edition, and in the text, which is now made to agree with that of the same editor. The Addenda at the end have also been somewhat cut down.

Colloquia Latina. By BENJAMIN L. D'OOGHE, M.A. D. C. Heath and Co., Boston, U.S.A. 1888. 12mo. Pp. 81.

MR. D'OOGHE's little volume deserves a welcome from all teachers of elementary Latin, were it only for the page of 'Hints and Suggestions' which introduces the dialogues. 'Read each sentence,' says the author, 'through carefully several times until you think you know its meaning; but do not translate it into English, for you must learn to read and understand Latin in the natural order of its words and thoughts without an artificial rearrangement into the English order.' This is thoroughly sound doctrine and most refreshing to a mind wearied with the mechanical habits of so many of our schools. Indeed, one of the most crying needs of the time in classical teaching is a reform in the all too prevalent custom of not only

translating every thing Latin into a *sui generis* kind of English, but translating first and trying to discover from the translation what the meaning of the Latin is. We would not be understood to maintain that translation into English should not be used at all by beginners in Latin. It is, of course, only through such translation that the teacher can tell whether the pupil understands his Latin and discover the points which trouble him—at least, without devoting an impossible amount of time to each individual pupil. But we have become so wooden in the practice of construing with its time-honoured custom of plunging into a Latin sentence for its subject and then its verb, or *vice versa*, and afterwards appending the other words, that any fresh and more rational suggestions such as Mr. D'Ooge offers us arouse a feeling of lively gratitude.

In point of interest for the youthful mind the dialogues before us attain a happy medium between the rapidity of certain earlier productions of the kind and the learned lifelessness of others. The vocabulary used is in general excellent and calculated to help the pupil when he comes to the reading of the classic writers. The 'Notes and Questions' too which follow each dialogue are often admirably suggestive. We do not feel sure of the utility of calling attention so much to English words from the Latin stems. Such words often have a puzzling variation of meaning from that of their prototype, and furthermore are not always so clear in themselves to the young pupil as to help him materially in his Latin. We could wish at all events that when feasible they were combined in the notes with synonymous words from Saxon stems.

It is a pity that a book possessing so many good qualities should be marred by some rather serious defects of detail. Exceptional words or constructions are sometimes used where a commoner Latin idiom might easily be found. For example the sentence *si jocularis sit me rogas?* (p. 38) seems to us an unfortunate expression for 'you ask me *whether* it is funny?' and is not *ridicula* a better word than *jocularis*? Sometimes the author is betrayed into awkwardnesses through his familiarity with Greek idiom, as is conspicuously shown by his fondness for the interjection *ὦ* with the vocative. The Romans, like the English, confined the use of the interjection to more solemn address than is to be found in the *Colloquia*. Notwithstanding the excellent advice of his introductory suggestions, Mr. D'Ooge does not always arrange his own Latin 'in the natural order of its words.' We would suggest *Adesse non poteram* for *Non adesse poteram* (p. 24) and *Nam hercle America feris tantum idonea est non hominibus* for *A. est tantum idonea feris non hominibus* (p. 30). On p. 18 does not the author mean *Auctoritatem in eum nullam habeo*, and, if not, would not *illum* be better than *eum*? So on p. 42 we are inclined to think that emphasis requires the arrangement *Cernere eum, matrona, ego non possum*. In general we miss in much of Mr. D'Ooge's Latin the smooth and natural rhythm of the selection from Terence which forms the last dialogue of the *Colloquia*. We do not speak of these points in a spirit of hypercriticism but with the hope that they may be rectified in another edition of the little book, which in spite of some faults ought to find a place on every Latin teacher's desk.

HENRY PREBLE,
Harvard University.

EX VOTO DEDICATIONS FROM KOULAH (KOLOE).

WITHIN the last few years a considerable number of inscribed marbles have been discovered at or near *Koulah*, relating to the worship of *Anaëtis* or *Μήτηρ Ἀνάειτις*. In some of the inscriptions she is identified with *Artemis*, and sometimes is associated with the god *Men* or *Men Tiamou*. She was evidently regarded with deeply superstitious fear in the neighbourhood, and was worshipped as a deity of healing. The inscriptions referred to will be found printed in the *Μουσείον καὶ Βιβλιοθήκη* of the Evangelical School at Smyrna (*περίοδος* iii.), volume for 1880, pp. 127, 158, 164, 165; and *περίοδος* v., 1884-5 *passim*; *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, iv. (1880) p. 128. *Koloe* was the name of a town and lake of *Lydia*, north of the river *Hermus*, where there stood a well-known temple of the goddess, of which *Strabo* (xiii. 626) speaks as follows, his testi-

mony being remarkably confirmed by these inscriptions: ὑπόκειται δὲ τῇ πόλει (*Sardes*) τό τε Σαρδιανὸν πεδίον καὶ τὸ τοῦ Κύρου καὶ τὸ τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ καὶ τὸ Καῦστριανόν, συνεχῇ τε ὄντα καὶ πάντων ἄριστα πεδίων. ἐν δὲ σταδίοις τετταράκοντα ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἔστιν ἡ Γυγαία μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ λεγομένη [*λίμνη*], Κολόη δ' ὕστερον μετονομασθεῖσα, ὅπου τὸ ἱερόν τῆς Κολοπῆς Ἀρτέμιδος μεγάλην ἀγιστείαν ἔχον. φασὶ δ' ἐνταῦθα χορεύειν τοὺς καλὰ θοὺς κατὰ τὰς ἑορτάς, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ποτὲ παραδοξολογοῦντες μᾶλλον ἢ ἀληθεύοντες. The inscriptions however are some two centuries later than *Strabo*; they are usually dated (of course by the era of *Sulla*, B.C. 84), and belong to the second or third centuries. The following two documents have not, I believe, as yet been published. I print them from impressions kindly sent to England by Mr. Dennis, H.M. Consul-general at Smyrna.

1.

Marble stelè, adorned with a bas-relief representing a draped female figure with right hand raised. Underneath the relief is the inscription.

ΘΕΑ ΑΝΑΕΙΤΙΚΑΙ ΜΙΝΙΤΙΑ ΜΟΥ
ΜΕΛΤΙΝ-ΙΚΑΙ ΓΛΥΚΩΝ ΑΠΕΔΩ
ΚΑΝΤΟΙΕΡΟΠΟΙΗΜΑ· ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣ
ΤΟΥΝΤΕΣ· ΕΤΟΥΣΤ· Μ· ΞΑΝΔΙΚΟΥ

Θεᾷ Ἀνάειτι καὶ Μηνὶ Τιμίῳ
Μελτίνῃ καὶ Γλύκων ἀπέδω-
καν τὸ ἱεροποίημα, εὐχαρισ-
τοῦντες· ἔτους τ' μ(ηνὸς) Ξανδικοῦ . . .

'To the goddess *Anaëtis* and to *Men Tiamou* *Meltine* and *Glycon* paid their due sacrifice, with thanksgiving: in the year 300 (= A.D. 216), in the month *Xandicus*. The formulæ are the same in several inscriptions

of the series. *Meltine* is a name not uncommon at *Koloe*; see *Le Bas-Waddington*, No. 700, and *Μουσείον καὶ Βιβλιοθήκη*, 1884-5, p. 54. The figure in the relief is evidently *Meltine* in an attitude of worship.

2.

Marble stelè, with bas-relief of similar character, representing a draped female figure with right hand raised.

ΜΗΤΡΙΑΝΑΕΙΤΙ· ΑΥΡ· ΜΟΥ
ΣΑΙΟΣΑΝΑΔΕΞΑΜΕΝΟΣ· ΤΗΝ
ΑΔΕΛΦΗΝ· ΑΦΦΙΑΝΣΤΗΛ
ΛΗΝ· ΑΠΑΙΤΗΘΕΙΣ· ΑΠΕ· ΔΩ
ΚΑ· ΕΤΟΥΣ· Τ· Κ· Θ· ΜΠΕΡΕΙΤΙΟΥ· Β

Μητρὶ Ἀνάειτι Αὐρ. Μου-
σαῖος ἀναδεξάμενος τὴν
ἀδελφὴν Ἀφφίαν στήλ-
(λ)ην ἀπαιτηθεὶς ἀπέδω-
κα· ἔτους τκθ· μη(νὸς) Περειτίου ς.

'To Mother Anaeitis, I Aur. Musaeus, acting on behalf of my sister Aphphia, at (her) request duly rendered a (votive) tablet: in the year 329 (= A.D. 245), on the 2nd of the month Pereitius.'

Musaeus is his sister's surety. She has

been healed by the goddess, or owes some ex voto as a thank-offering. Her brother therefore supplies the funds for this purpose, and Aphphia is represented in the relief in act of adoration.

E. L. HICKS.

NOTES.

NEW WORDS AND FORMS FROM THE EPIDAUROIAN CURE INSCRIPTIONS. 'Εφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική. 1883, pp. 211 ff.; 1885, pp. 2 ff.

(1) Ἀλικός (I. I. 120; II. II. 19, 69), τὸ κτητικὸν of Ἀλκίς, according to Steph. Byzant. s.v. Paus. II. 36, 1, gives the name of the town as Ἀλίκη, deriving the form very likely from these cure inscriptions, since he adds that he knows of no credible allusion to the place or its inhabitants, except in these very Aesculapian records. Cf. Bursian, *Geog. v. Griech.* II. p. 98, N. 3, Emendations to the readings in Paus.; Wilamowitz, *Hermes*, xix. p. 449; Pantazides, *Ephemeris*, 1886, p. 144.

ἄστας = ἄστας (I. 112), ἄστας = ἄστας (II. 53). (2) ἡτερόπτερος (I. 72), same word spelled with double λ (I. 34). The word means 'with one eye diseased,' cf. ἡτερόκωφος, ἡτερόμαλλος. The spelling with a single λ is probably correct. πτερος is used of a person afflicted with πτελωσις, Galen, 10, 432. The mistake, if it be one, of writing the word with a double λ could easily arise from the fact that the Doric ὀπτερος so spelled is found elsewhere (I. 40, 75, 126) on one of the stelae. Kavnadias (*Ephemeris*, 1883, p. 225) writes as if ὀπτερος was the second part of the compound, which of course it is not. πτερος, however, seems sometimes to have been written with double λ. Cf. Thesaurum, s.v. πτελωσις.

(3) τὰς δεμέλεας (I. 98, 100) probably = βδέλλας: cf. the gloss of Hesych. δεμβλεῖς· βδέλλαι. The word in Hesych. seems a doubtful one at best and should very likely be corrected.

(4) δενδρών (II. 20). The connexion is as follows: οὗτος (sc. παῖς Ἀριστοράτος ἀλικός) ἀποκολυμ[β]άσας εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν ἔπειτα δενδρῶν εἰς τόπον ἀφίκετο ξηρόν, κ.τ.έ. The meaning of the word δενδρῶν may be gathered from the last words of a gloss in the *Etymol. Mag.* s.v. δενδράζειν. Σημαίνει καὶ τὸ καθ' ὅσους δύεσθαι καὶ κρύπτειν ἱαντόν: cf. Hesych. s.v. δενδράζειν. Also Hesych. Photium, Suid. s.v. ὑποδενδράζειν. Also Curtius, *Grundzüge. d. Griech. Etymol.* I. 204.

(5) ἐπιπῆν (I. 119). The sense requires a form of πᾶσσω. Query: √πας-(?) *πᾶω(?)

(6) ἦνικε (I. 110) for ἦνικε. Kavnadias (*Ephemeris*, 1883, p. 226) says that this form occurs several times in an inscription from Troezen, soon to be published in the *Ephemeris*. This I have not as yet been able to find.

(7) ἱατρα (I. 45; II. 7, 35) = ἱατρεία, a physician's fees.

(8) περὶ Κορνούς (II. 29). Where Corni was, it is impossible to say. It lay without doubt on the road between Epidaurus and Phrae, the home of the patient in the record of whose cure the name occurs. But which Phrae?

(9) κυκᾶνι (I. 103—4) = κυκῶνι.

(10) μεθάμερα (I. 114), cf. σήμερον, σήμερα.

(11) ῥόπτων (II. 41-2), the connexion is... νιν ποιδῆσαι ποτ ῥόπτων. The sense seems to call for ῥόπτων. Hesych. has ῥοπτίον· κλειδίον, which suggests nothing. (12) συντίθησι (I. 84) 2nd pers.

(13) ποτ = ποτί, *passim*. This is, however, not entirely new. Kavnadias (*Ephemeris*, 1883, p. 222) cites the form in an inscription from Troezen. Lebas, II. 167a.

J. R. WHEELER.

Cambridge, Mass.

* *

UNREGISTERED WORDS IN EPICETUS.—In reading Arrian's *Discourses of Epictetus*, I have noticed the following words, of which no mention at all is made in Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon*:—

1. ἀναποτεύκτως, not liable to fail in obtaining: comparative adverb, iv. 6, 26.
2. ἀπεριπτάτως, not liable to fall, iv. 6, 26.
3. ἀποτευκτικῶς, liable to fail in obtaining, iv. 10, 6.
4. ἐπιπελλίζω, stammer, iii. 24, 88.
5. μεγαλοφῶς, with a noble spirit, ii. 17, 19.
6. νευμάτιον (dimin. of νεῦμα), a little nod, iv. 13, 22.
7. ὀρνιθάριος, an augur, ii. 7, 12. See Schweighäuser's note.
8. ὀρδινάτιον (*ordinatio*), an appointment to office, iii. 24, 117. The word is used in this sense by Suetonius (*Domitian*, ch. 4).
9. ὀπτικία in iii. 24, 117 seems to stand for the Latin *officia*. The usual form of this Latin word in Greek seems to have been ὀφφικία, which I think ought to be substituted here.
10. οἰκοδομημάτιον (dimin. of οἰκοδόμημα), a little dwelling, ii. 15, 9. The MSS. have οἰκοδόμημα τι ἔν. Upton restored the text as above, and Schweighäuser

approves. Epictetus is exceedingly fond of diminutives.

11. *πραιτωρίδιον*, small *praetorium*, here probably small house, iii. 22, 47.

12. *πούλβινος* (*pulvinus*), iii. 23, 35. Here probably a *pulpit* with a cushion is meant.

13. *συνεπικούρειοι*, fellow-Epicureans, ii. 20, 13.

14. *Φειδιακός*, belonging to Phidias, ii. 19, 23.

I have also found the following words, the special meanings of which are not noticed in the Lexicon:—

1. *ἡ πέμπτη* the fifth hour (not day), i. 1, 29. Meibomius was the first to point out the mistake of here translating 'the fifth day.'

2. *συνεσφίρω*, to admit in conjunction with, i. 2, 28. There is here no connexion with the meaning of the verb as used by Xenophon and others of contributing to the war-tax.

3. *πρόσθεσις*, *assent*, opposed to *ἐποχή*, *suspension of judgment* (technical terms of the Stoics) i. 4, 11. Wolf was the first to point out that the word is here used for the usual expression *συγκατάθεσις*.

4. *ἀφορμῶν* (a Stoic word), to *avoid*, opposed to *ὁρμῶν*, to have an inclination, i. 4, 14 &c. In the same way *ἀφορμή*, disinclination, is opposed to *ὁρμή*, iii. 2, 2 &c.

5. *μεταπίπτοντες λόγοι*, *sophistical arguments* in which the meaning of propositions or of terms, which ought to remain the same, is skilfully changed and perverted into a different meaning, i. 7, 1 &c. See Schweighäuser's note.

6. *ἐπιφύρα* (a logical term), to infer a conclusion from premises, i. 7, 16 and 19; iv. 1, 61, τὸ ἐπιφερόμενον = *ἐπιφύρα*. See Upton's note.

7. *Καesarianoι* (*Caesariani*) of the Codex Justinianus), official procurators of the emperor: also called *Catholiciani*. They dealt with fiscal matters, i. 19, 19.

8. *λοιπὸν* = *igitur*, i. 24, 1; ii. 5, 16; 7, 9; i. 29, 5.

9. *ἀπὸ μέρους* = *ex parte*, i. 27, 17.

10. *ὁποροῦν* = *ἀνθυποροῦν*, an objection, i. 29, 40.

11. *ὁ ἀναλυτικός*, one who knows how to resolve syllogisms, ii. 3, 4.

12. τὸ ἀνόβαλλον, that which is improper, ii. 11, 3.

13. *ἐκπτώσις ψυχῆς*, aberration of soul, ii. 17, 21.

14. *ἡσυχάζω*, quiescent (a kind of syllogism), ii. 13, 18. See Cicero (*Acad.* ii. 29).

15. *βαλὼν κάθευδε*, lie down and sleep, ii. 20, 10. This passage is wrongly explained in the Lexicon *lay down and slept*. See also iv. 10, 29, *βέγγω βαλὼν*, I lie down and snore.

16. *ἀλείπτρις*, rubber of oil on the body after bathing, iii. 3, 1; 26, 22. Of course the usual meaning of the word is 'trainer in the gymnasium.' Juvenal vi. 422 uses the word as here.

17. *διορθωτής*, an official under the emperor, iii. 7, 1. In Latin *corrector*. See Ammianus Marcellinus 27, 3: Terentius hanc eandem provinciam *correctoris* administraverat potestate.' Also Eutropius 9, 13. Again Trebellius Pollio says: 'Aurelianus eum *correctorem* totius Italiae fecit.'

18. *ὕδατιον*, watery humour of the human body, iii. 13, 15.

19. *μονομαχία*, fight of gladiators, iii. 16, 13.

20. *μυρρίνα*, myrrhine (vases), iii. 9, 21. This form of the word is not noticed in the Lexicon. It is evidently the same as Pliny's *murrhina*.

21. *ἀναρχία*, a private station, not holding office, iii. 20, 17; iv. 4, 2, 23 and 33; 6, 2 and 23. This is a meaning that ought to be noticed.

22. *αἰτέω*, to beg alms, = *mendicare*, iii. 22, 10. Here equivalent to *ἐπαίτεω*: as the grammarians say that *αἰτής* was used for *ἐπαίτης* and *προσαίτης*.

23. *θεομαχία*, fighting against God, iii. 24, 24. The word usually means a battle of the gods.

24. *προφέρω*, boast, iv. 1, 21. In the same sense *παράφέρω* is used in the *Encheiridion*, 33, 8.

25. *ἐπιθειάζω*, admire, iv. 1, 108. Hesychius defines *ἐπιθειάζω* = *ἐχόρευεν* or *ἰθαύμαζεν ὡς θεόν*.

26. τὸ ἀνεκτικόν, patience; τὸ ἀφεκτικόν, abstinence, iv. 4, 18.

27. *μύσταξ*, beard, iv. 11, 28. The word must here be used for *πάγων*. It is evidently our *moustache*. Hesychius defines it *μύσταξ* = αἱ ἐπὶ τῷ ἄνω χεῖλει τρίχες, hair upon the upper lip. In this passage of Epictetus a man is described with a 'mystax' reaching down to the knees, which surely cannot refer to a moustache.

E. J. CHINNOCK.

* *

HOMER, *Od.* ix. 481—486, 537—543.

ἦκε δ' ἀπορήξας κορυφὴν ὕρεος μεγάλοιο

κὰδ δ' ἔβαλε προπάροιθε νεὺς κυανοπέρροιο

483. [τυτθόν, ἐδεύησεν δ' οἴηιον ἄκρον ἰκίσθαι.]

ἐκλύσθη δὲ θάλασσα κατερχομένης ὑπὸ πέτρης·

τὴν δ' αἰψ' ἤπειρον δὲ παλιρρόθιον φέρε κύμα

486. πλημυρὶς ἐκ πόντιοι, θέμωσε δὲ χέρσον ἰκίσθαι.

* * * * *

αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' ἐξαυτὶς πολλὸν μέγιστα λαὸν αἰέρας

ἦκε ἐπιδυήσας, ἐπείρσειε δὲ ἴν' ἀπέλεθρον,

κὰδ δ' ἔβαλεν μετόπισθε νεὺς κυανοπέρροιο

540. τυτθόν, ἐδεύησεν δ' οἴηιον ἄκρον ἰκίσθαι.

ἐκλύσθη δὲ θάλασσα κατερχομένης ὑπὸ πέτρης·

542. τὴν δὲ πρὸσω φέρε κύμα, θέμωσε δὲ χέρσον ἰκίσθαι.

ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ τὴν νῆσον ἀφικόμεθ', κ.τ.λ.

It is quite clear that these two descriptions have been assimilated in defiance of all sense. All the editors, as far as I am aware, with the exception of La Roche, rightly bracket line 483, as a mere duplication of 540, for it is manifestly absurd that a stone falling a little in front of the ship, could graze the rudder. In 486 the quantity of *πλημυρὶς* is remarkable. All its derivatives have *υ*, and in the word itself *υ* does not recur before Apoll. Rhod. who perhaps on the authority of this passage felt himself justified in occasionally employing it. Its meaning too seems to be rather the regular tidal rise of the sea, than the 'wash' caused by the falling rock. *θέμωσε δὲ χέρσον ἰκίσθαι* clearly means 'forced the ship inshore,' though the first word occurs only in these passages, and the violation of the law forbidding trochaic caesura in the fourth foot will be noticed. [None of the alleviating conditions mentioned in Monro's *Homeric Grammar*, § 367, are applicable here.] When his ship was driven under the cliff on which the Cyclops was standing, Odysseus silently thrust her off with a pole, and his comrades prudently rowed her out twice as far as she had been before, (line 490), when Odysseus makes known his name and taunts the monster. The stone now hurled is far larger, and naturally falls short, narrowly missing the rudder. The 'wash' now carries the ship towards the island which lay off the shore of the mainland. But can this be explained by a repetition of *θέμωσε δὲ χέρσον ἰκίσθαι*? No mention has been made of the island for more than 300 lines, and so the expression 'drive her in on the shore' could only mean as before that the ship was again driven towards the Cyclops, the opposite of what is manifestly intended. The translators recognise the sense by the rendering 'the

further shore,' but this is not in the text. Is it not probable that this line (542) also is due to the effort of the scribe to assimilate the passages? It would remove the objection to transpose *χέρσων* with *νῆσων* in the next line. 'Drive her to the island. But when we reached the shore &c.' Or it might be better simply to bracket the repeated words, as having banished beyond recovery the original latter half of 542. Indeed the whole line with the preceding (541), a duplication of 484, might well be spared. If, along with them, 486 with its anomalies, which is certainly not required after *ἡπειρον δέ* in 485, were obelised as an early explanatory interpolation, the narrative would lose nothing, and we should not be driven to supplying ideas from our inner consciousness in order to obtain sense.

P. SANDFORD.

* *

HOM. *Il.* xviii. 571, 2. τοὶ δὲ ῥήσσοντες ἀμαρτῇ
μολεπῇ τ' ἰνυγμῷ τε ποσὶ σκαίροντες ἐποντο.

The received translation (due apparently to Ap. Rh.) of *ῥήσσω* is 'stamping.' But (1) This makes *ποσὶ σκαίροντες* rather an otiose repetition. (2) *μολεπῇ τ' ἰνυγμῷ τε* must surely refer to the grape-gatherers not to the single voice of the boy; we should expect therefore to find in *ῥήσσοντες* a verb with a sense suited to these words. (3) *ῥήσσω* seems to be a collateral form of *ῥήγγνυμι*, which means 'to break' not 'to beat.' Why should it not mean 'breaking forth' of the voices of the gatherers, so that the translation should be 'and they breaking forth all together with joyous burst of song followed the music with dancing feet,' that is, they were represented joining in the refrain or chorus of the Linus song and dancing as they sang it?

H. M. STEPHENSON.

* *

THUCYDIDES V. 111. καὶ ἐνθυμείσθε πολλάκις ὅτι
περὶ πατρίδος βουλευέσθε ἢν μᾶς περὶ καὶ ἐς μίαν βουλὴν
τυχοῦσάν τε καὶ μὴ κατορθώσασαν ἔσται. The Scholiast
in his paraphrase gives exactly the sense required: καὶ
πολλάκις πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν λάβετε ὅτι περὶ πατρίδος ἢ
σκέψις, μᾶς ὁδὸς, περὶ ἢς ἐν μιᾷ βουλῇ ἢ κατορθώσετε
ἢ σφαλῆσεσθε. The only question is:—given the his-
torian's meaning, to find what were his words. I
believe he wrote καὶ ἐνθυμείσθε πολλάκις ὅτι πατρίδος
βουλευέσθε μᾶς περὶ, ἢν καὶ ἐς μίαν βουλὴν τυχοῦσάν τε
καὶ μὴ κατορθῶσαι ἔνεσται: 'and often bethink your-
selves that you are debating about a fatherland the
only one you have, and that this, standing to win or
lose on the result of only one debate, it will be in your
power to establish in security.' We have thus to do with
two corruptions. The first is connected with the words
μᾶς περὶ. I think our present reading may be ac-
counted for by supposing that these words were
omitted in some archetype MS., that *περὶ* was then put
in to supply their place before *πατρίδος*, and that sub-
sequently the original words *μᾶς περὶ* were written in
the margin and thence found their way into the text,
but not in their proper place. The other corruption,
in the last two words, is not really very hard to cor-
rect or to account for. After the construction of *ἢν*
had been obscured, it was not unnatural that the in-
finitive *κατορθῶσαι* should pass by a process of assimila-
tion into the participle.

E. S. THOMPSON.

* *

EURIPIDES, *Bacchae*, 1156—1158.

ὃς τὰν θηλυγενῆ στολὰν
νάρθηκά τε πιστὸν Ἀἶδαν
ἔλαβεν...

This is the reading of the MSS. and it is accepted by Sandys, though he acknowledges that in the expression *πιστὸν Ἀἶδαν*, 'a sure pledge of doom,' the use of *πιστὸν* has no parallel except Homer's *σὺς αἰ-
πὸς ὄλεθρος* (*Il.* 13, 773). He himself suggests *προὔπ-
τον Ἀἶδαν* or *βάκτρον* or *κέντρον Ἀἶδα*. But anyone
who reads the passage is at once struck with its simil-
arity to a previous passage in which Dionysus fore-
tells to the chorus the doom of Pentheus (*Il.* 857—
859):—

ἀλλ' εἰμι κόσμος ὄνπερ εἰς Ἀἶδου λαβῶν
ἔπεισι μητρὸς ἐκ χειρὸν κατασφαγείς
Πενθεί προσάψων.

We should certainly expect the chorus in the pas-
sage before us to echo Dionysus' words, now ful-
filled. By a very slight change in the MSS. reading
we get what is wanted. Read

νάρθηκά τ' ἐπὶ στόμ' Ἀἶδα
ἔλαβεν.

For the expression *στόμ' Ἀἶδα*, compare Pind. *Pylh.*
4, 44, *χρόνιον Ἀἶδα στόμα*: *Georg.* iv. 467, *Taenarias
fauces, alta ostia Ditis*. The expression *στόμ' Ἀἶδα*
is used advisedly, for Pentheus' shade would not gain
admission to the 'House of Hades' until the rites of
burial had been granted to his mutilated body.

N. MACNICOL.

* *

EURIPIDES, *Hel.* 293-7.

τί δ' ἔστ' ἐτι ζῶ; τίν' ὑπολείπομαι τύχην;
γάμοις ἐλομένη τῶν κακῶν ἀπαλλαγὰς,
μετ' ἀνδρὸς οἰκεῖν βαρβάρου, πρὸς πλουσίαν
τράπεζαν ἵζουσ'; ἀλλ' ὅταν πόσις πικρὸς
ζυγὴ γυναικί, καὶ τὸ σώμ' ἔστιν πικρόν.

The difficulty lies in the last line for which various
corrections have been proposed. Matthiae gives καὶ
τὸ σώζεσθαι πικρόν, Hermann καὶ τὸ σώμ', Scaliger καὶ
τὸ δῶμ', and Lord Macaulay suggested καὶ τὸ βρῶμ'
ἔστιν πικρόν 'an emendation favourably regarded in
the Trinity Combination-room.' I propose to read
καὶ τὸ πῶμ' ἔστιν πικρόν, 'the husband's bitterness
makes even the wine-draught bitter.' There is of
course a play upon the words *πόσις* and *πῶμα*.

HUGH MACNAGHTEN.

* *

NOTES ON PLATO.—*Republic*.

362 B. πρῶτον μὲν ἄρχειν ἐν τῇ πόλει δοκοῦντι
δικαίῳ εἶναι, ἔπειτα γαμεῖν ὁπόθεν ἂν βούληται, ἐκδιδόναι
εἰς οὓς ἂν βούληται, ξυμβάλλειν, κοινωνεῖν οἷς ἂν
ἐθέλῃ.

The asyndeton *ξυμβάλλειν, κοινωνεῖν*, both of which
words ought to connect with οἷς ἂν ἐθέλῃ, points to
some corruption. Either *κοινωνεῖν* is a gloss upon
ξυμβάλλειν, or, which is more likely, καὶ has fallen
out before *κοινωνεῖν*. Cf. *Laws* 738 A: τὰ ξυμβόλαια
καὶ κοινωνήματα.

380. Α. ἀλλ' ἐάν τις ποιῇ [ἐν οἷς ταῦτα τὰ ἱαμβεῖα
ἔνεστι] τὰ τῆς Νιδῆς πάθη.

The words I have bracketed are a plain gloss upon
τὰ τῆς Νιδῆς πάθη. First, Socrates would almost

certainly assume that his audience knew what play he was quoting. Secondly, the title of the play was *Niobe*; Plato says, 'if any poet describe the woes of Niobe,' not 'if he write the *Niobe*,' but this latter is required if we keep the words I reject. Thirdly, it would be silly for any author to talk about any poet writing the particular play in which these iambs occur, when he has just quoted them as by Aeschylus: οὐδ' αὖ ὡς Αἰσχύλος λέγει ἐπαιὼν ἀκούειν τοὺς νέους ὅτι κ.τ.λ.

398. E. Tives οὖν θρηνηθεὶς ἁρμονίαι; λέγε μοι· σὺ γὰρ μουσικός. Μιζολυδιστί, ἔφη, καὶ συντολυδιστί καὶ τοιαῦτα τῖνες. Οὐκ οὖν αὐταί, ἦν δ' ἐγὼ, ἀφαιρεταί; ἄχρηστοί γὰρ καὶ γυναιξίν ἄς δέῃ ἐπικεῖναι εἶναι, μὴ ὅτι ἀνδράσι.

The tone of this sentence is very suggestive of a hit at some person unnamed, a habit of which Plato is fond, (e.g. *Phaedrus* 229 D., *Sophist* 246). If so, there can be little doubt who is the person alluded to. Plutarch, *De Musica*, cap. xvi., writes: 'Ἀριστόξενος δὲ φησὶ Σαπφὴν πρότερον εὐρασθαι τὴν Μιζολυδιστί..... ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἱστορικοῖς τῆς Ἀρμονικῆς Πυθοκλείδην φασὶ τὴν αὐλητὴν εὐρετὴν αὐτῆς γεγενῆσθαι. Now Aristoxenus, 'who was so near to the time of the better music as to have been a pupil of Aristotle' (W. W. Lloyd, *Age of Pericles*, vol. ii. p. 230), is the best authority we can get, and these two passages seem corroborative of one another, the hint in Plato, who connects Μιζολυδιστί with γυναικες, supporting Aristoxenus against his opponents, and the statement of Aristoxenus making clear the allusion in Plato. If this be so, it is evident that Plato had no high opinion of the virtue of Sappho, and this is another difficulty in the way of those who fondly fancy that Sappho was a model of ἐπικεινεία.

It must be added that there is no necessary contradiction between the two statements about the discovery of the mode. Discoveries have a curious way of occurring to two people at about the same time, of which several instances might be quoted.

In connexion with Plato's dislike to Μιζολυδιστί the following is interesting (Plutarch, *De Musica*, xxxvii.): 'Ἀργέλιος... φασί... ζημιῶσαι τὸν ἐπιχειρήσαντα πρῶτον τοῖς πλείοσι τῶν ἐπὶ τὰ χρῆσθαι παρ' αὐτοῖς χορδῶν καὶ παραμιζολυδίζειν ἐπιχειρήσαντα.

The whitewashing of Sappho is well known to have begun with Maximus Tyrius, but I do not remember to have seen his position correctly stated. It is simply this: 'Socrates speaks of loving young men whom he really only instructed; so no doubt Sappho really only instructed the young women whom she describes herself as loving. And so those whom she describes as rivals were equally without doubt rival teachers of poetry.' One can hardly suppose that Maximus himself seriously expected to take anybody in with this ridiculous analogy.

402 A. ὅτε τὰ στοιχεῖα μὴ λαμβάνοι ἡμᾶς, ὀλίγα ὄντα, ἐν ἅπασιν οἷς ἐστί, περιφερόμενα.

ἐν ἅπασιν οἷς ἐστί is an extremely harsh phrase. It cannot mean *in all that are*, as Davies and Vaughan take it, for you cannot attract a relative in the nominative into the case of the antecedent in good Attic. It must therefore mean *in all in which they are*. This is confirmed by the exactly parallel passage just below (402 C): πανταχοῦ περιφερόμενα γνωρίζομεν καὶ ἐνόντα ἐν οἷς ἔνεστιν αἰσθάνομεθα. But here we have a rational phrase such as would be expected—ἐνόντα ἐν οἷς. I believe therefore that ἐν has dropped out after ἐν ἅπασιν, and that we should read ἐν ἅπασιν ἐν οἷς ἐστί.

537 C. τὰ τε χύδην μαθήματα παισὶν ἐν τῇ παιδείᾳ γενόμενα τοῖσι συναντήσιν εἰς σύνοψιν οἰκειότητος ἀλλήλων τῶν μαθημάτων καὶ τῆς τοῦ ὄντος φύσεως.

The only way of construing οἰκειότητος ἀλλήλων

τῶν μαθημάτων is to take οἰκειότητος ἀλλήλων closely together, regarding ἀλλήλων in fact as equivalent to an adjective, the whole phrase then meaning 'co-relationship of the sciences.' But though this sounds all very well in English, the Greek remains 'very tolerable and not to be endured.' Is it really possible to believe that Plato could be guilty of such a piece of style as to write ἀλλήλων τῶν μαθημάτων side by side when he meant ἀλλήλων to go with another word, and might just as well have written κοινῆς or some such word instead? Besides, the repetition of μαθημάτων after μαθήματα in the same sentence, without any obscurity of meaning if μαθημάτων be omitted, is quite unaccountable; if the sentence had been αὐτῶν τε τῶν μαθημάτων καὶ κ.τ.λ. the repetition would have been justified, as it is not.

Omit then τῶν μαθημάτων as a gloss upon ἀλλήλων.

ARTHUR PLATT.

* * *

ON ACTS xv. 23. The translators of our R.V. give in Acts xv. 23 the phrase 'the Apostles and the elder brethren,' omitting thus in the Greek text the second καὶ οἱ. I will assume this to be the correct text. They thus make πρεσβύτεροι an adjective. Had it been so, it would be nearly impossible to account for the insertion of that second καὶ οἱ, because the fact of its character as an adjective would have governed the exegetic tradition, would have appeared moreover in the early versions, and have made the insertion of words involving a new departure of exegesis morally impossible. But, further, to take it adjectivally distorts the entire narrative in which the verse forms a link, and not only violates a homogeneous literary context, but mars a record of connected facts. If therefore the laws of Hellenistic grammar absolutely required that adjectival character, we might reasonably suspect the text corrupted in v. 23. Let us see what that context yields. In xv. 2 we have πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους καὶ πρεσβυτέρους, in 6 οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, in xvi. 4 ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων. It is noteworthy that in xv. 2 and xvi. 4 πρεσβυτ. has no article, while in xv. 6 it has. But usage is not precise as regards the distinctive article in such instances. Thus in purely proper names we find xiii. 46 ὁ Παῦλος καὶ ὁ Βαρνάβας, but in 51 ἐπὶ τὸν Παῦλον καὶ Βαρνάβαν: so in classes or genera, as xiv. 5, τῶν ἐθνῶν τε καὶ Ἰουδαίων, so Eph. ii. 20, τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, and more remarkably in the Lucan narrative, Acts x. 12 πάντα τὰ τετράποδα καὶ ἐρπετὰ τῆς γῆς καὶ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, but in Peter's recital of the same, xi. 6 τὰ τετράποδα... καὶ τὰ θηρία καὶ τὰ ἐρπετὰ καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ, the latter inserting all the articles which (after the first) the former omits; compares also Matt. xvi. 21 with xxvi. 57, 59. Thus it is plain that in Acts xv. 2, 6, and xvi. 4 the presence or absence of the article leaves the expressions cited equivalent and indifferent. Nor are xxi. 18 and 25 without their force: in the former, the narrative, πάντες οἱ πρεσβ. are recorded as present, in the latter, the words of James contain the emphatic ἡμεῖς, naturally referring to the πρεσβ. as included with himself: cf. also James v. 14, παρακαλεσάσθω τοὺς πρεσβ., the writer of which presided in the Council of Acts xv., formulating its decree or presumably influencing its language. These passages, then, all conduce to the conclusion that in Acts xv. 23 πρεσβ. should be a noun. To make it an adjective throws the whole out of harmony. I proceed to show

¹ Tischendorf's text is here followed from which the *text. rec.* differs in some of the instances cited.

further that there is no need whatever to deem it an adjective, and that *οἱ πρεσβ. ἀδελφοί* may reasonably be two nouns apposed. An apposed noun being in the nature of a predicate may, like it, be anarthrous, unless under special conditions. In Acts xv. 23 the coupled terms to which *ἀδελφοί* is apposed have each its article; in Matt. xxiii. 13 *οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ φαρισαῖοι*, being vocative, are naturally anarthrous, and *ὑποκριταί* apposed, like *ἀδελφοί*, is so also. I have been unable to find in the LXX. or the New Testament an example of *ὁ πρεσβύτερος, οἱ πρεσβ. &c.* used as an epithet. It seems mostly to mean a limited official class, or sometimes a person or persons naturally older. As instances of the former, take from the story of Naboth, 3 K. xx. 8, 11 (= 1 K. xxi. 8, 11 in A.V.), *ἀπέστειλε... πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβ. καὶ τοὺς ἐλευθέρους, καὶ ἐποίησαν οἱ ἄνδρες... οἱ πρεσβ. καὶ οἱ ἐλευθέροι* (notice here that *οἱ ἄνδρες*... is due to a strict following of the Hebrew), also Gen. l. 7 (of Pharaoh's House and of Egypt), Levit. iv. 15, Num. xi. 16, 25, Deut. xxxi. 28, (here compare the phrase *ἡ γερουσία τῆς πόλεως* or *ὁμῶν* in Deut. xxv. 8, 9, xxix. 10), Judges viii. 14 (of Succoth), 1 K. xvi. 4, xxx. 26, 4 K. vi. 32, x. 1, Ezr. x. 8, Joel ii. 16 (anarthrous in this last passage, *ἐκλέξαθε πρεσβ.*).

I proceed to show that in practice as well as on the principle above stated an apposed noun may have or not have the article, when the leading noun has it. Thus in 3 K. xxi. 15, 17, 19, the phrase of A.V., 'The young men of the princes (of the provinces)', appears in the LXX. under an apposition, in 15 as *τοὺς ἄρχοντας τὰ παιδάρια*, both having the article, in 17 as *ἄρχοντας παιδάρια*, neither having it, in 19 as *ἄρχοντα τὰ παιδάρια*, one having it, the other not, the Hebrew represented being in our text identical in all three. In 19 the *ἄρχοντα* appears modified in gender to suit the neut. *παιδάρια*, but is as clearly a noun as in 1 Chron. xix. 3 *εἶπον ἄρχοντες* (anarthrous)... *πρὸς Ἀνάν*, and as in 4 K. x. 1 *πρὸς τοὺς ἄρχοντας τῆς Σαμαρείας*. Compare again the well-known apposition, 'my (or 'his') servants the prophets,' recurring in our A. V. some seventeen times. Fifteen of these have *τοὺς δούλους* or *τοὺς παῖδας μου* (or *αὐτοῦ*) *τοὺς προφ.*, but 4 K. xxi. 10 *ἐν χειρὶ δούλων αὐτοῦ τῶν προφ.*, and so Ezr. ix. 11; but in 4 K. xxiv. 2, the phrase otherwise identical has *τῶν* before *δούλων*. Again, in Is. xlv. 14, 15, we have *καὶ οἱ Σαβαὶμ ἄνδρες ὀφθαλμοί...* and *ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ σωτήρ*, which in respect of the noun anarthrous apposed to one having the article is exactly like our phrase... *καὶ οἱ πρεσβ. ἀδελφοί*. Other similar instances will be found in Ezek. xxiii. 12 and 23. Further, in the common form of phrase where name and title (of kings &c.) are apposed, Greek usage in the LXX. is vague as regards either noun having the article: see Jer. xxvi. 2, xxiv. 6, xxxvii. 11, 1 K. ii. 22 *et passim*, xii. 1, 1 Chron. xxix. 9, Ezr. i. 1, 2, where the same short context has two opposite examples.

So far then as the LXX. is a key to the usage of Hellenistic Greek, these instances, which might easily be multiplied, show that no inference can be drawn for or against apposition from the presence or absence of the article with *ἀδελφοί*, and that it may be apposed either to *οἱ πρεσβ.* only, or, as suits the immediate context better, to *οἱ ἀπ. καὶ οἱ πρεσβ.* as a whole. We may notice also in Acts xv. 23 a mark of carefully formulated language, suitable to a solemn document of authority, in the fact of the article being prefixed to each of the words *ἀπ.* and *πρεσβ.*, whereas in the ordinary narrative of xv. 2 we find *πρὸς τοὺς ἀπ. καὶ πρεσβ.*

It is, further, proper to remark that, probably owing to *οἱ πρεσβ.* (and even *ὁ πρεσβ.*) having acquired an official stamp, the adjectival use of *πρεσβύτερος* is

generally specialized by repeating the article with it. Thus in Gen. xxiv. 2, *τῷ παιδί αὐτοῦ τῷ πρεσβ. τῆς οἰκίας*, xxvii. 1, *Ἠσαῦ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν πρεσβ.*, Job i. 13, *ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτῶν τοῦ πρεσβ.*, Ezek. xvi. 46, *ἡ ἀδελφὴ ὁμῶν ἡ πρεσβ.*; and so Luke xv. 25, *ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ὁ πρεσβ.*, which is more remarkable, since in 13 we read *ὁ νεώτερος υἱὸς*, and so 1 Tim. v. 11, *νεωτέρας δὲ χήρας παραιτοῦ, i.e. the correlative νεώτερος, not having been similarly officialized, was used freely as an adjective. Now these instances, taken together with the previous ones, make it nearly certain that, if 'the elder brethren' had been in the writer's mind in Acts xv. 23, we should have found there οἱ ἀδελ. οἱ πρεσβ., or οἱ πρεσβ. τῶν ἀδελφῶν; cf. τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῶν ἱερῶν 4 K. xix. 2, Is. xxxvii. 2.*

Therefore, since the context of Acts xv. and xvi. requires the sense gained by apposing *ἀδελφοί*, and since such a large amount of usage favours apposition, and makes against the adjectival use of *οἱ πρεσβ.* here, we may feel reasonably sure that the exclusion of the second order of the clergy from their place at the head of the Encyclical conveying the decrees of this oldest council of the Church, is altogether unwarranted, and that 'the Apostles and presbyters brethren' (*i.e. as, or being 'brethren'*) is the true meaning of the text here followed.

H. HAYMAN.

* *

EPISTLE OF S. JAMES, IV. 5.—A very much disputed reference of citation is found in *ἡ γραφὴ λέγει*, James iv. 5. In order to make our exegesis well founded we must review the previous context. St. James is rebuking the lustful heart whose insatiable cravings lead to strife and bloodshed and whose prayers therefore fail of their effect; he concludes with a clause in which the words and punctuation given¹ by the best authorities seem in conflict with our A. V. and R. V., as... *ἵνα ἐν ταῖς ἡδοναῖς ὁμῶν διαπνήσητε, μοιχαλίδες*. Both versions make the clause end with the verb; and A. V. reads *μοιχοὶ καὶ μοιχαλίδες*, without due authority (iv. 1-3). Whether, however, we construct *μοιχαλίδες* with v. 3 or v. 4 is of little moment. He passes on to dwell on a special lust which not only wars within a man (v. 1) but wars against God and is his declared enemy (v. 4), that of adultery. In no one sin are the world and the flesh so closely allied perhaps as in breaches of the Seventh Commandment. Some commentators diverge here into the notion of spiritual adultery, *i.e.* idolatry; but this seems unsuited to the simple directness of S. James, as well as to the very plain previous context. Then comes v. 5, *ἡ δοκεῖτε ὅτι κενῶς ἡ γραφὴ λέγει, πρὸς φθόνον ἐπιποθεῖ τὸ Πνεῦμα ὃ κατῴκησεν (or κατῴκησεν) ἐν ἡμῖν*. These last words which follow *λέγει* (or *λέγει* *πρὸς φθόνον*, if that is the connexion) should certainly be a quotation, as is the clause which follows *δὶδ λέγει* in v. 6. But no quotation to that effect, nor anything like it, is to be found in our LXX. or Hebrew. Nor have I been able to find an instance in which *ἐπιποθεῖ* is used in a bad sense, 'lusteth,' as A. V.¹ I think then that a lacuna must be conceded here. Suppose *c.g.* such a quotation as the Second Commandment, 'the Lord your God is a jealous God,' to have dropped out, then the sense following is suitable, understanding *φθόνος* as in paraphrase = *ζῆλος*, 'The Spirit which has lodged within us longs for us

¹ Of *ἐπιποθεῖ* in a good sense we have instances. Ps. xli. 1, lxxxi. 2, cxvii. 131.

(even) to jealousy, but bestows a greater grace'—i.e. more powerful to win than His jealousy to punish us. There is certainly an instance in which ζηλώω appears as = φθονέω in Num. xi. 29, μὴ ζηλοῖς ἐμέ (an inexact rendering of the Heb.), where A. V. is 'Enviest thou for my sake?' and R. V., 'Art thou jealous for my sake?' I do not think λέγει can be taken absolutely, 'speaketh,' i.e. as = λαλεῖ. Nor is λέγει πρὸς φθόνον, as if = πρὸς τὸν φθονερόν (abstract for concrete), suitable to the simplicity of S. James. I will only add that κατέκρινεν seems better supported than κατέκρινεν, although the difference is in sense unimportant. If in the first copy made from the original, through homoioteleuton or otherwise, the quotation following the first λέγει dropped out, it may have influenced all now extant copies, since no chain is stronger than its weakest link. To such accidents transcription is liable from the very first stage throughout. The attempts to make sense where no connexion really exists are foolish and fruitless. To recognize an actual loss is nearer the truth than to pretend that all is entire, which is what both the A. V. and the R. V. seem here to do.

H. HAYMAN.

* *

Amph. v. 1, 20 :

Sed quid hoc, quis hic est senex qui ante aedis nostras sic iacet ?

Since publishing the conjecture *seminex* in the last number of the *Classical Review*, I have obtained, what I had previously sought in vain for, a copy of Luchs's tract on the quantity of *hic*, nom. masc. Luchs, as is well known to all Platine students, has tried to prove that *hic* is always short in the nom. masc. in Plautus. I did not know how he proposed to treat any of the following passages, except the first, on which Leo had written since the publication of the tract.

Amph. i. 1, 144 :

Clare aduorsum fabulabor : hic auscultet quæ loquar.

Capit. i. 1, 30 :

Nunc hic accepit quæstum hunc filii gratia.

Curc. v. 3, 38 :

Libera hæc est, hic huius frater est hæc autem huius est soror.

Pers. v. 2, 50 :

Tace stulte : hic eius géminus frater. Hicines ? ac geminissimus.

I was surprised to find that Luchs took no notice whatever of the last three passages. There are several others more doubtful which Luchs has probably rightly decided in favour of *hic*. But these four by themselves, especially the first, which cannot be easily emended to suit *hic*, are sufficient to show that Luchs's theory must be considered not proven. Still, having said so much I must confess that the research I have made on the point made me repent of having proposed to make *hic* nom. long here : for certainly *hic* is always short in this particular phrase *quis hic est* !—a phrase which occurs often in Plautus : but I am not disposed to withdraw my conjecture, for I cannot conceive it possible that *Amphitruo* could be called *senex*, a name given by Plautus only to greybeards or those who have sons or daughters grown up. The verse may be scanned as a trochaic septen-

arius. *Sed quid hoc* as one foot begins *Truc.* iv. 2, 57, perhaps also *Poen.* v. 5, 17, both trochaics : it also begins *Aul.* ii. 9, 6, and *Most.* ii. 2, 14, iambic trimeters.

A. PALMER.

* *

PLAUTINA, *Mostellaria* iii. 2, line 803 sqq.

In several passages of Plautus lurk plays upon words, some of which have escaped our notice, and some baffle discovery. A play of words more or less sustained occurs in the *Mostellaria*, loc. cit. Tranio, the tricky slave, has induced Theopropides to believe that his son has taken to speculation, as the son of a shrewd merchant should ; and that he has purchased the house occupied by old Simo. He then goes to Simo and begs that he may be permitted to show Theopropides the house, as the latter wishes to inspect it, and to use it as a model after which he may construct one for himself. Theopropides asks Simo if he would allow him to look over the house, believing it to be his son's speculation. Simo allows him to do so : and Tranio begs Theopropides not to speak of the house to Simo as if it were other than his own, from mere delicacy. Theopropides agrees : and Tranio acts as showman, taking however the audience into his confidence the while. He first asks ostensibly Theopropides, but in reality the spectators, if they see 'ante aedes vestibulum et ambulatorium quouismodi,' in which words there may well lurk some *double entente* like 'scarecrow and walking gentleman.' This is however mere conjecture. He then says 'Age specta, postes quouismodi ! Quanta firmitate facti et quanta crassitudine !' He means, besides calling attention to the stoutness of the door-posts, to say 'look at these blockheads ! how impassable and how stupid !' Cf. Ovid *Remed. Amor.* v. 35 'rigido jurgia posti dicere. Varro *apud* Non. actually uses the expression 'crassi senes.' Simo goes on to say that he has actually given three minae for them. Theopropides says that they are 'multo improbiore quam a primo credidi' : a word strictly speaking applicable to grasping men. Tranio goes on to remark 'intempestivos excisos credo : id eis vitium nocet.' 'I think they are untimely brought to ruin' : 'excindere' has *always*, I think, a metaphorical meaning, though of course he means the two old gentlemen to think of the timber felled when too green. 'Atque etiam nunc satis boni sunt si sunt inducti'—pice ! And I think that they are as it is good-natured enough if only they are lured on ! He puts in the pice *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*. Specta quam arte dormiunt ! See how thoroughly asleep they are ! He here understands by *arte* 'by my tricks' as well as *arte*.

The next passage is the *Captivi* 888 sqq. Stalagmus the slave had kidnapped Paegnium when a boy, the son of Hegio, and sold him to Theodoromedes. At the end of the play Ergasilus asks Hegio what was the nationality of Stalagmus. Hegio replies he was a Sicilian. 'Nay,' says Ergasilus, 'he is now a Boian' : he has espoused a Boian (the fetters)—liberorum quaerendorum causa ei credo uxor data est : I think he got the *boia* for looking up (kidnapping) children : besides the obvious meaning.

HERBERT A. STRONG.

* *

HORACE *Od.* i. 37, 1.

nunc est bibendum, nunc pede libero
pulsanda tellus, nunc Saliaribus
ornare pulvinar deorum
tempus erat dapibus, sodales.

The general meaning of these words is 'Now drinking, now dancing, now public thanksgiving are fitting.' Horace expresses the idea of fitness in the first place by a gerund, in the second by a gerundive, and in the third (probably merely for variety's sake) by the idiomatic phrase 'twere time,' (i.e. 'if we were wise' or the like). The stanza is one which, if the emphasis is rightly placed, is perfectly simple, and, if it is misplaced, is hopelessly complex: fix the eye on *nunc est*, as has generally been done by editors, and you are led on to *nunc erat* and to confusion; connect *nunc* with *bibere* ('now for a drink') and you pass on to *nunc pulsare* and *nunc ornare* with perfect ease.

The best illustration of *tempus erat* is to be found in Martial's caustic epigram 4, 33.

Plena laboratis habes cum scrinia libris,
Emitis quare, Sosibiane, nihil?
'Edent heredes' inquis 'mea carmina.' Quando?
Tempus erat jam te, Sosibiane, legi.

In the fourth line *jam* clearly goes with the infinitive, and is strikingly emphatic while *tempus erat* is used here almost simply as equivalent to 'it is right' or 'fitting'—'we ought to be reading you now.'

T. E. PAGE.

* *

VIRG. *Aen.* ii. 492.

labat ariete crebro
janua, et emoti procumbunt cardine postes.

Conington, Kennedy, and Papillon ignore this passage in their notes, and Sidgwick is obscure. Conington's rendering 'and the valves are torn from their hinges, and brought down,' may be taken as an illustration of the vague meaning the words convey to most readers.

The word *cardo* in no way describes anything like a modern 'hinge,' and the word *postes* in no way corresponds to anything which we mean by 'door-posts.' *Cardo* has two meanings, (1) 'a pivot,' (2) 'a socket,' and in technical writings you can accordingly have *cardo masculus* and *cardo femina*. In an ancient door, the pivots on which it turns are at the top and bottom, and work in sockets in the upper and lower lintel. Now, as these pivots afford the only support the door has, they must have been of considerable strength. If therefore a door had to be made, the carpenter (for we may dismiss the idea of finely turned metal) would naturally at once look out a stout 'post,' which would have to perform a double duty, for it would first have to be carefully turned at each end so as to provide the pivots on which it revolves in the sockets, and also it would have to carry the weight of the door-frame which must be attached to it and be supported by it. At any rate, writing as an ἰδιώτης, I can conceive no simpler way of making a rude door of the ancient type.

As therefore the 'post' is such an important part of a door, it can be, and often is, put for the door itself. Here however it is used strictly of the actual 'posts' of the double doors. You might of course break through such a double door by merely forcing back each half without moving the 'posts,' but supposing that it will not so yield in the middle, there is only one way of breaking in, and that is the way which Virgil is accurately describing here,——'torn out of the (supporting) sockets the posts (and therefore the doors too) fall flat.'

Probably this explanation is given somewhere, but I have myself never seen it.

T. E. PAGE.

* *

PROPERTIUS I. VIII. 25, 6.

Et dicam: 'licet Artacii considat in oris,
Et licet Hylleis: illa futura mea est.'

This is how the passage at present stands in Professor Palmer's edition: but even the emendation of Artacii is by no means altogether satisfactory. Artacii is very close to Atracii, the reading of the Neapolitanus and Perusinus, but it is hard to extract any sense suitable to the present passage from the comparison with the phrase in Apollonius Rhodius, κρήνη ἦν Ἀτρακίη. The Hylleis of Muretus is also hardly relevant to the sense, which requires that one of the words should represent a distant place, and the other a place near to Rome, whence we may suppose Propertius to be writing this poem. In the place of Artacii, Atracii, Antarcii, and Antariis have been variously read, and in the place of Hylleis, Eleis, Hileis, and Ellaeis. Possibly the true reading is:—

Et dicam: 'licet Oriciis considat in oris,
Et licet Herculeis: illa futura mea est.'

The rendering of this would be: whether my lady moors her bark on the distant Illyrian shores of Oricos, whither she is going, or in the harbour of Herculanum when returning, near or far, she will be faithful to me all the same. If the first word is to express distance, no word is more fit than Oriciis, as Oricos has already in the poem (l. 20) been mentioned as the destination of Cynthia's voyage. And Herculanum, a seaport town near Rome, on the coast of Campania, is appropriate as the harbour to which Cynthia would probably return. Besides, Herculeis oris is confirmed by Herculeis litoribus (l. xi. 3), the repetition being entirely more Propertiano. The adjective form Oricius is found also in Virgil, *Aen.* x. 136.

Oriciis could easily be corrupted into Atracii by the confusion of *i* and *t*, as elsewhere in MS. of Propertius. The frequent dropping of *r*, especially before or after *c*, and confusion of *i* and *e*, would also account for Herculeis becoming Hileis.

S. WIMBOLT.

* *

PROPERTIUS, I. XI. 21.

An mihi nunc maior carae custodia matris.

Professor Palmer here deserts the *non* read by both Neapolitanus and Perusinus for *nunc*, a correction of Hertzberg.

Could not *non* be retained and defended by an exactly parallel Greek usage? Greek idiom was probably as attractive to Propertius as Greek mythology.

Sophocles (*O. C.* 1729) has μὴν οὐ, equivalent to a strong *nonne*, and parallel passages are Eurip. *Medea* 733, Aesch. *Supp.* 417, and Plat. *Pol.* 291 D. May not *an-non* similarly stand for an emphatic *nonne*? The parts of the two expressions exactly correspond: why should not the whole expressions?

An, like μὴν, implies the answer no: *non* = οὐ: therefore μὴν οὐ = an *non*.

We should then take *custodia* as abstract for concrete (cf. *timoris* in preceding line) and meaning, cherished object: Is not a dear mother's cherished object (i.e. Cynthia) very dear to me also, and have I any thought for life apart from thee?

S. WIMBOLT.

* *

PLINY, *Ep. ad Trajanum*. 113.—Pliny has consulted Trajan as to whether any honorarium should be paid by members of the *boule* on their election by the censors. The *lex Pompeia*, he says, does not lay down any rule on the subject, though it was the custom for those who were 'adlecti super legitimum numerum' by the emperor to pay a certain sum. Trajan's reply, after refusing to lay down a general rule, is thus given in the earliest editions—'Id ergo quod semper tutissimum est, sequendam cujusque civitatis legem puto, scilicet adversus eos qui inviti sunt decuriones. . . . id existimo acturos ut praefatio ceteris praeferatur'; the last clause being generally taken to mean, 'I imagine that the censors will take care that those who promise to pay (praefatio=qui praefati sunt) should be preferred to the others.' The use of the abstract for the concrete however seems here intolerable, and Orelli emends 'ut praestatio ceteris proferatur,' 'that payment should be deferred in the case of the rest.' No satisfactory sense however is furnished by this rendering, and Mommsen accordingly fills up the lacuna by 'Qui sponte fiunt' and alters the last words to 'ut praefati id ceteris praeferantur,' 'those who are made senators with their own consent will, I imagine, take care to be preferred to others by promising to pay the fee.'—May not the true reading be, adopting Mommsen's rectification of the lacuna, 'ut praestatione ceteris praeferantur,' 'by payment of the fee'?—This gives as satisfactory a meaning, while it gets rid of the very awkward 'id.'

E. G. HARDY.

* *

TACITUS, *Hist.* i. 10, 4. *in secretum Asiae sepositus*.

Mr. Onions (*Journ. of Phil.* No. 34, p. 289) after noticing that *sepositus* is an emendation of *Acidalius* for the MSS, *sepositus* remarks—'Sepositus however seems scarcely satisfactory as Tacitus always appears to use *sepono* of compulsory retirement, while Otho's (*sic*) withdrawal was purely voluntary.' *Sepositus*, it seems to me, is clearly right here. The whole sentence runs:—'Licinius Mucianus vir secundis adversisque juxta famosus. Insignes amicitias juvenis ambitiose coluerat: mox attritis opibus, lubrico statu, suspecta etiam Claudii iracundia, in secretum Asiae sepositus, tam prope ab exule fuit quam postea a principe.' The last words seem distinctly to imply that the withdrawal was not a voluntary one, though not technically an exile. Now we know from Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* xii. 1.) that Mucianus had been at one period of his life the legate of Lycia and Pamphylia, which might well be described as a sequestered part of Asia Minor, and I believe it is to this quasi-

banishment to an insignificant provincial government that Tacitus alludes. In that case the informal punishment of Mucianus by Claudius is exactly parallel to that of Otho by Nero. Mucianus had given offence probably, as Heraeus suggests, in connexion with Messalina and was 'in secretum Asiae sepositus': Otho had given offence in reference to Poppaea Sabina, and was 'sepositus per causam legationis in Lusitaniam.' Conf. Tac. *Hist.* i. 13 'mox suspectum in eadem Poppaea in provinciam Lusitaniam specie legationis seposuit.' It is needless to say that Asia is frequently used in the wider sense of Asia Minor.

E. G. HARDY.

* *

THE word *status*, evidently the origin of the French *etat* and our *state*, has never, so far as I am aware, in Classical Latin the meaning of *state* in the sense of *commonwealth*. It seems however to bear this meaning in Ammianus Marcellinus (III. 8, 11) in the letter of Julian to Constantius, explaining his reasons for having assumed the title of Augustus, and defending his course of action in so doing.

'Et conditionum aequitatem, quam propono, bona fide suscipito, cum animo disputans, haec *status Romano* prodesse, nobisque qui caritate sanguinis, et fortunae superioris culmine sociamur.'

This seems to be the earliest use of the word in the sense of *republic*, which has now become one of its common meanings. It is remarkable that no notice has hitherto been taken of this.

E. J. CHINNOCK.

* *

THE ABOLITION OF THE DICTATORSHIP.—Merivale (*History*, iii. 93), Ramsay (*Manual of Roman Antiquities*), and other English writers say that the dictatorship was abolished by Antony in 44 B.C., and the statement has been copied into many schoolbooks. It is at the same time inaccurate. As Mommsen (*Staatsrecht*, ii. 685) points out, the dictatorship 'abolished,' *i.e.*, forbidden for the future, in 44 was the extraordinary office held by Caesar, which is distinct from the dictatorship of the Punic Wars. It is true Cicero says in the 1st Philippic that Antony abolished the dictatorship, but it merely suited his argument to identify the two offices which really agree only in title—and not entirely in that. As Mommsen shows, a dictatorship was not regarded as impossible in B.C. 22 (cf. Mommsen, *Res gestae divi Aug.*, i. 31 = p. 23 of the second edition).

F. HAVERFIELD.

CLASSICAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

EDUCATION in the United States falls roughly into four stages: that of elementary instruction or of the 'common schools'; the secondary ('high schools,' 'academies,' etc.); the collegiate; and the professional or the university stage (in the strict sense of the latter word). For each of these stages, generally speaking, distinct institutions are provided, with clearly-drawn dividing lines. In the 'common schools' ('primary' and 'grammar,' the latter being the continuation of the former) maintained by local

civil authorities at public expense, children are furnished with the rudiments of general education in English; they usually leave these schools between the ages of thirteen and fifteen. In the secondary education (the 'academic education' of the Congressional Directory) there are two distinct classes of institutions: the so-called 'high schools,' maintained by the local civil authorities, and the endowed 'academies,' some of which, because of their relation to the colleges, are also known as 'preparatory' or 'fitting'

schools. The high schools commonly confine themselves to an 'English' education, and to the elements of the sciences, taking up the children at the close of their course at the common school. Occasionally, especially in the New England States and in the larger cities, the course is expanded so as to include optional instruction in elementary Latin (sometimes Greek), French, German, etc. As a rule, however, the high schools do not regard the preparation of students for college as a part of their work. Most of those who have passed through the high school go out into active business life, or begin their professional studies at once without first 'going through' college: their average age is between sixteen and eighteen. The hiatus commonly existing between the course of study at the high school and the standard required for admission to college is a serious weakness in our system: with the rapid development of the high schools, and the simultaneous decrease in the number of academies, it portends disaster to the colleges, and widens the breach between the popular and the higher education. Academies and other preparatory schools are of various kinds: the prevalent type, at least in New England, is that represented by the Phillips Academy at Andover, Massachusetts, of which I shall speak later on; it comprises a flourishing classical department, in which Latin, Greek, and elementary mathematics with a few other subjects (a little French or German, etc.) are taught, and a smaller English department, which, omitting Greek, offers a course of study substantially equivalent to that of the best high schools. The very successful Lawrenceville school in New Jersey, and St. Paul's at Concord, New Hampshire, have some points of resemblance to the English schools (Eton, Rugby). Boys enter the preparatory school between the ages of fourteen and seventeen, and remain at school for three or four years; those who complete the studies of the classical department commonly enter college. In most of the academies the course of study is rigidly prescribed for the first three years; in the concluding, or 'Senior' year, choice is permitted between certain specified branches of study, according to the pupil's selection of a college.

The college is the especial seat of liberal education in the United States. In the typical northern colleges the course of study for the Bachelor's degree is divided into four years, known as the Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior years: the young men who enter college together and thus graduate together constitute a college class, which is designated by the year of the B.A. degree; thus the present Sophomore class in the northern colleges is also the 'class of '91.' The number of weeks of required residence each year is on the average thirty-six or thirty-eight, and the number of college lectures and 'recitations' to be attended weekly, apart from prayers, at which attendance is not everywhere prescribed, averages from twelve to fifteen hours weekly. Instruction is almost wholly received in the college lecture-rooms from college teachers; 'private coaches' are almost unheard of, except at the larger universities at the time of examinations. The four-year college course is as old as collegiate education in the United States, and the resulting 'class' organization is one of its most interesting features. It is to the graduate the source of his most pleasant recollections of college life. Some institutions, recently founded, have endeavoured to obliterate the 'class' lines, and encourage students to prepare for their degrees without reference to the 'class' with which they entered college; men of more than average gifts or industry may thus obtain their B.A. in less than four years. But the majority of colleges make no such provision. There are,

further, no distinctions in the Bachelor's degree that make necessary a longer period of residence for the more honourable degree, as in the case of the English Pass and Honour degrees.

Within fifty years the American college has undergone most important changes. These are well illustrated in the history of Harvard, our oldest and largest university. I shall therefore be pardoned for giving considerable space to the description of the development and present condition of this institution, as that of a type. In 1838, at Harvard College—with one-fifth as many undergraduates as to-day—an inflexible and uniform programme of studies was laid down for all the students: for entrance the candidate was examined in the whole of Virgil and of Caesar, in Cicero's Select Orations, in Adams' Latin Grammar, and in the writing of Latin; in Jacobs' Greek Reader, the four Gospels of the Greek Testament, the Gloucester Greek Grammar, and in writing Greek; in Lacroix's Arithmetic, Euler's Algebra, and in the Elements of Geography, Ancient and Modern. The course of instruction in college comprised: *Freshman year*—Xenophon's Anabasis, Demosthenes and Aeschines on the Crown; Livy, Cicero's Brutus; Geometry, Algebra, Trigonometry, and Tytler's History. *Sophomore year*—Sophocles' Oed. T., Oed. C., and Antigone, Euripides' Alceste; Horace; Analytic Geometry, Differential and Integral Calculus, Natural Philosophy; Whately's Rhetoric and Logic. *Junior year*—Homer's Iliad, twelve books; Cicero's De Officiis and Juvenal; Natural Philosophy and Chemistry; Paley's Evidences and Moral Philosophy, and Butler's Analogy. *Senior year*—Natural Philosophy, Astronomy; Locke on the Human Understanding; Say's Political Economy; Story on the Constitution of the U.S.; Smellie's Philosophy of Natural History; lectures on Rhetoric and Criticism, on Theology, Mineralogy, and Anatomy. Through the first three years there was further instruction in Greek and Latin Composition, and in Classical Antiquities; in the three concluding years English Composition, Declamations, Themes and Forensics in appalling numbers, together with one Modern Language, formed with the above-named studies the main occupation of the students; there were also occasional lectures on other subjects. This list indicates, with minor modifications and the substitution of modern books, the best type of collegiate education prevalent in the United States until about ten years ago, and still to be found in some of the more conservative institutions. Harvard herself, it should be added, as early as 1846 greatly modified this curriculum by the extensive introduction of the elective principle in the Junior and Senior years.

Of late three new types of the American college have come into existence, in addition to that of the older college with the fixed uniform curriculum, in which all the studies are prescribed for each student. These are, first, the colleges where there are practically no prescribed studies, the student being expected to select his own studies subject only to the condition that a definite number of courses must be chosen, and that the studies in a particular department are to be followed in a prescribed sequence (Harvard). The second type is that of colleges where the studies of the earlier years are prescribed, while towards the close of the student's course a certain liberty of choice is granted (Yale, Princeton). The third type is where related courses of study are thrown into groups, one of which the student is to select once for all on entering college, certain general subjects being usually prescribed for all of the groups in common (the undergraduate department of Johns Hopkins University). The present tendency in all the colleges is towards an

increase in the number of elective studies and in liberty of choice. The advocates of the elective system in its extreme form maintain that at the age when students enter American colleges, with the preparation demanded of them, a sounder intellectual and moral growth is promoted where the student is allowed to determine for himself his own future course of liberal study, alike in its general features and in its details, than where all this is done for him. They hold that the principle of 'protection' is inapplicable in advanced liberal education, whatever may be its value in economics. With a healthy popular sentiment, the instinct for self-preservation in culture, of which Mr. Matthew Arnold has told us, will save and perpetuate the studies that are essentially fruitful and life-giving. Whatever view may be held as to the wisdom of unrestricted liberty of election, all are agreed that instruction under the new system has vastly improved, that the possession of liberty quickens the sense of responsibility, and that the pleasure and satisfaction in teaching is greatly enhanced by it. The elective system has not been tried long enough to furnish a basis for final judgment as to its effect on the relative popularity of university studies; the experience of six years at Harvard (ending 1885), seems to show that History, Natural History, Political Economy, Philosophy, German, Greek, Latin, French, Chemistry, English, Fine Arts, Mathematics, Physics, Music, Italian, Spanish, Roman Law, Semitic Languages, Sanskrit and Zend, in the order given, are the favourite studies; within this period the only subjects that showed a distinct increase in popularity are History and Political Economy; Greek and Mathematics held their own with surprising consistency; German, Philosophy, and Chemistry showed a considerable falling off. The tables of the next six years will doubtless show a different state of affairs. The defects to be apprehended in the elective system, viewed *à priori*, are a tendency to extreme specialization, to ill-advised and heterogeneous choices, to the selection of the easiest courses: President Eliot of Harvard, who has examined and analyzed the choices of two large college classes, finds that such apprehensions are without ground except in the case of a very few persons. Encouragement to wise concentration of study is afforded by Honour courses in Classics, Mathematics, and other subjects, but the number of courses prescribed for Honours is so limited as not to impair the students' liberty of pursuing also other lines of work.

As regards the qualifications for admission, most of the New England colleges prescribe certain books and subjects known as the minimum requisitions or the 'elementary studies'; to these minima some colleges add certain advanced studies known also as the maximum requirements, a choice from which is to be made by the candidate, and instruction is provided in college in all the 'advanced studies.' This selection from among these advanced studies makes necessary a provision for elective studies at the preparatory schools. The 'elementary studies' at Harvard College are English (composition, involving the previous reading of several standard books); Greek (translation at sight of simple Attic prose, with elementary grammar questions); Latin (translation at sight from prose with questions as above); German and French (translation at sight of ordinary prose in both languages); History, including Historical Geography (either of Greece and Rome, or of England and the United States); Mathematics (Algebra through Quadratics and Plane Geometry); Physical Science (either elements of Astronomy and of Physics, or forty experiments performed at school in certain branches of Physics). The 'advanced studies'

comprise: Greek (translation at sight from Homer, or from Homer and Herodotus); Latin (translation at sight from Cicero and Virgil); Greek and Latin composition (translation of connected English narrative based, in Greek, on a prescribed portion of Xenophon, and, in Latin, on certain of the Lives of Nepos); German (considerable portions of five classical writers, with translation at sight and composition); French (as in German); Mathematics (Logarithms, Plane Trigonometry, and Solid Geometry;—or elements of Mechanics and Analytic Geometry); Physics (laboratory course); Chemistry (laboratory course). These elementary and advanced studies may be combined in several different ways, the general result being that a young man may enter college without Greek, if he have Latin, or without Latin, if he have Greek; but in either case difficult equivalents in Mathematics and Physical Science are prescribed which secure a high order of previous training. In fact the alternative requisitions are offered by an extremely small percentage of candidates. In New England Harvard is the only college that admits to the B.A. course without Greek. In other colleges, somewhat more than the elementary studies are prescribed for admission, with the occasional addition of one or two of the advanced studies.

Admission to college may be either by examination alone, as at Harvard and Yale, or a leaving certificate may be required from some school of high standing, stating that the candidate has completed the subjects prescribed for admission, as in the majority of New England colleges. When the system of admission on certificate was first adopted, only a few years ago, it was believed by some that it would raise the standard of the schools; the system seems at present to be falling into disfavour, and many of the schoolmasters who hailed it with delight are now asking for its abolition. The spirit of independence that characterizes all our institutions, not to speak of the practical inconveniences in so large a country, makes it impossible for a college to exercise such a strict supervision over the preparatory schools as with safety to dispense with the entrance examinations. The attempt is made in Michigan, where there exists a state system of education, but the reports as to its success are by no means unanimous in its favour.

Above the colleges in our American system stands the university stage of instruction, comprising not only the professional schools, but also the 'graduate' department of the university: here men are trained for the several professions (law, medicine, divinity), or for skilled activity in advancing learning or science; the several schools and the 'graduate' department have distinct faculties, and are conducted independently of each other. The courses of university or professional study extend commonly over at least three years, and lead to the higher degree: Ph.D. and M.D. in the 'graduate' and in the medical departments respectively; B.D. and LL.B., in the divinity and law schools. In the more progressive institutions an intermediate degree of A.M. is given for a certain term of liberal study in the graduate department, or even in the professional schools. In some of the older colleges, however, the custom still holds of conferring it without examination, on the payment of a small fee, upon bachelors of three or more years' standing.

Each of the older universities has grown out of a single college, which still remains, in point of numbers, its most important element. (Out of the 1,899 students now in attendance at Harvard University, 1,180 are in the College). The college in the first instance was usually an institution founded for the training of 'ministers of the gospel,' and religious

traditions have ever been powerful in the older American colleges, as is seen, for example, in the custom of daily prayers or chapel; in fact, such traditions have brought into existence numerous colleges which, though at their foundation of the nature of denominational institutions, have mostly lost their sectarian character. The growth of Harvard is an interesting illustration of the development of the American college. It was founded in 1636 as 'a school or college,' and it remained a college for nearly two centuries. In 1812 the Divinity School was established, in 1817 the Law School, in 1847 the Lawrence Scientific School. The 'University now comprehends the following departments: Harvard College, the Divinity School, the Law School, the Lawrence Scientific School, the Medical School, the Dental School, the Bussey Institution, the School of Veterinary Medicine, the Graduate Department, the Library, the Observatory, the Botanic Garden and Herbarium, and the Museum of Comparative Zoology.' These departments are all under the control of the Corporation, consisting of the President, five Fellows—elsewhere usually called trustees—and a Treasurer, and each is administered by its own faculty or board of instruction and management. The Johns Hopkins University at Baltimore—the best known of the newer universities—was founded in 1876, and at once began with a graduate department (non-professional, philosophical faculty), and with a small undergraduate department. It is the only university in the country where the graduate or university element is not distinctly overshadowed by the undergraduate or college element. Its unique and signal success is due to the skilful development of the graduate side.

There has been of late years a gradual rise in the average age of students coming to college: whereas fifty years ago this age was below seventeen, it is now

close upon twenty. Professional schools have likewise improved and prolonged their courses of instruction, and a demand for skilful and accomplished teachers in the higher schools, academies, and colleges has led to the establishment of graduate courses of liberal study at the University. A consequence of these movements is that college graduates enter active professional life from three to five years older than was the case fifty or even thirty years ago, and on the average do not become self-supporting before the age of twenty-eight or thirty. The effect of this is to diminish proportionally the number of men who go to college: young men prefer to omit the collegiate stage of education and to begin professional study without adequate preparation. Among the remedies which have been suggested that of the reduction of the college course from four to three years has met with some favour.

Such is the environment of classical education in the United States, and such are the general conditions under which classical studies are here pursued, and classical scholars and teachers produced. We are now in a position to undertake a detailed examination of our subject, which it is hoped will be the more intelligible for the foregoing remarks. In subsequent letters I propose, in compliance with the Editor's invitation, briefly to describe the discipline received in the classics by the vast number of youths who still make classical studies the basis of their education, and to point out the main features of our higher classical scholarship as shown in the special training received by our advanced teachers, and in the contributions made by American scholars to classical philology.

J. H. WRIGHT.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
December 14, 1888.

OBITUARY.

THE LATE PROFESSOR PALEY.

By Professor Paley's death, which took place on Saturday, December 8th, at his residence in Boscombe, one of the ripest and most industrious classical scholars of our day has passed away, at the age of seventy-two. Many notices of his life and works have appeared in the *Times*, *Athenæum*, and other papers; and in Timbs's *Men of the Time* a catalogue of his chief works, corrected by himself, is given, so that perhaps it is needless to repeat them in detail here. He was born in 1816, at his father's rectory of Easingwold near York, the eldest of several still living brothers, grandson of the well-known author of the *Evidences of Christianity*. Thence he moved to Shrewsbury School, then under the rule of Dr. Butler (afterwards Bishop of Lichfield), and thence in due time to St. John's College, Cambridge, where he took his B.A. degree in 1838, not appearing as a candidate for classical honours: for he had

no fancy for mathematics, even to the extent demanded for obtaining a 'junior optime,' which was then required from all classical honour candidates. As he did not win any of the University scholarships, there really was no evidence in his earlier career of the eminence he was ere long to attain as a student of the classics. His M.A. degree was taken in 1842, and he resided at Cambridge, reading and taking pupils, for four years. In 1846 he joined the church of Rome, left the University, and resided in Peterborough, Dover, and elsewhere for fourteen years, which he devoted (though never neglecting the Greek and Latin languages, which he loved so well) to the study of Gothic architecture, and also of natural science. He became a skilful botanist, and spent some time in studying the habits of earthworms: in fact, if it had not been for the appearance of Darwin's monograph on the subject, he might not

improbably have published the various notes he had made as to their habits, and their use in preparing the soil for the growth of plants. He was one of the original and most active members of the Cambridge Camden Society and edited (besides many contributions to the *Ecclesiologist* and similar publications) notes on churches round Cambridge, and also those round Peterborough: remarks on the architecture of Peterborough Cathedral, a manual of Gothic moulding (which has gone through four editions) and other works. He published also a *Flora of Peterborough*, a *Flora of Dover*, and various minor papers in Botany.

He returned to the University in 1860, on the partial removal of religious disability, and remained there for fourteen years, practising as a tutor in the classics, with marked success. He was a most conscientious and careful teacher. In 1874 he was appointed Professor of Classical Literature in the Roman Catholic college at Kensington, and soon afterwards Classical Examiner to the University of London.

Numerous editions of classical authors, both Greek and Latin, in the *Bibliotheca Classica* and separately, attest his industry, and, latterly, the accuracy of his scholarship. The first author which he took in hand was Aeschylus, publishing the plays separately with Latin notes. These were afterwards issued in one volume, and later in the *Bibliotheca Classica* with English notes. It is no treason to his memory to say that in the later editions his riper scholarship removed various blemishes which had marred his earlier work: he was himself fully conscious that we all must be learners to the end of our lives. However the early practice of composition in the Latin and Greek tongues secured him against the error of treating passages as if the order of the words had little or no significance, and the meaning of the text could be arrived at, after the fashion of some modern editors, by transposition of words, as one might deal with the pieces in a Chinese puzzle.

Besides the Aeschylus, he brought out editions of Sophocles, Euripides, three plays of Aristophanes, Hesiod, Theocritus, the *Iliad*, some private orations of Demosthenes, Ovid's *Fasti*, Propertius and some epigrams of Martial. He also published various English translations, one of the Fifth Book of Propertius in verse, portions of Plato and Aristotle, and, quite recently, the Gospel of St. John, and some witty fragments of the comic poets of Athens, in

NO. XXI. VOL. III.

English verse, very clever, accurate, and amusing. At an earlier period he issued two volumes of extracts from the Greek prose writers under the title 'Greek Wit.' Many of the above have passed through several editions. Various articles also in the *Edinburgh* and other reviews, in the *Journal of Philology* and other serials, are due to his fluent pen.

Notwithstanding all this industry, he was strangely indifferent to the study of modern tongues. He did not know a word of German, a singular thing for a student of the classics. Still his varied knowledge, quiet humour, and wide charity made him a delightful companion; it was impossible to be in his society without realising the charm of his conversation, and often gaining valuable information and unexpected light on difficult questions.

His views on the subject of the authorship of the poems which bear the name of Homer are well known. In sundry publications, as well as in the preface to his edition of the *Iliad*, he pointed out that the various legends connected with the story of the fall of Troy, which form the theme of many dramas of the Greek tragedies, are not to be found in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* as we now have them, but are in fact embodied in the poem ascribed to Quintus of Smyrna, who is commonly supposed to have derived his materials from the Greek poets Arctinus and Lesches. Paley argues that we have in these books the substance of the so-called *κύκλος* or round of legends clustering about the story of the siege of Troy: that this mass of semi-mythic tales formed really the Homer of the tragic poets, while our *Iliad* and *Odyssey* appear first distinctly in Plato's quotations—and were, in the Professor's view, themselves modelled out of the general stock of traditions, either in or not much before the age of Pericles: the language itself being no true ancient dialect, but artificial in its colour of antiquity, and full of comparatively modern phraseology. His views have found more acceptance in Germany than in England: it cannot be denied that he makes out a strong case, though it is hard to believe that a poet (or poets) of such transcendent genius as to give to each of the two poems their consistent unity and marvellous power and beauty should have arisen in Athens in the fifth century B.C., at such a brilliant epoch of literature, and left no trace of himself or his name for later generations. However, Paley himself never wavered in his convictions on this point.

Another favourite subject of discussion with

him was the unfair estimate usually formed of Euripides: he was fond of dwelling on his singular mastery of language and skill in argument, as well as his knowledge of human nature, though some perhaps will think that this is rather in regard of its frailty and weakness than of its nobler gifts. He was indignant also at the charge brought against Euripides of being a woman-hater, pleading that Alcestis was one of the noblest figures on the Greek stage, and that quite as many virtuous as vicious heroines were depicted in the extant plays of this dramatist.

Dr. Paley continued to the close of his life in the communion of the Church of Rome, and was buried with her rites in the churchyard of St. Clement's in Boscombe, a sort of suburb of Bournemouth, where the last seven years of his life had been spent. Still his loyalty to his adopted Church was not inconsistent with a spirit of the most free speculation, for he allowed no barriers to interfere with the search for truth. He was persuaded that no delusions, however time-honoured or approved, would avail to help a man in the last resort.

By Dr. Paley's death a gap is left in the ranks of living English scholars which there is no one exactly fitted to fill. Those who have enjoyed the privilege of intimacy with him now feel keenly the loss of a friend of singularly clear and candid mind, always ready to welcome any additions to his stock of knowledge, ready to listen to any argument temperately urged, and if he could not assent, to give reasons for his own view. The members of his own family know best the unvarying kindness and

unselfishness which prompted his every word and act in the social circle, but even friends who only were able to visit him occasionally could see something of the rare beauty of his character. No one who has known anything of him in social converse could fail to recognise in him an earnest seeker after truth, a gentle and loving nature, ever considerate towards others, and anxious to help them in all ways to the utmost of his power: as well as a mind stored with the most various and interesting knowledge, always at the service of his friends, but never forced upon them, worn, as has been well said of another pure soul, lightly, and like a flower.

C. B. S.

THE Rev. Thomas Field, late fellow of St. John's College, and one of Mr. Paley's younger contemporaries at Cambridge, writes as follows from Bigby Rectory, near Brigg, in Lincolnshire: 'Being at Madeira in November, 1852, I went round by the north side of the island and spent a night or two at Santa Anna, a house kept then by a Portuguese doctor. I there found and copied from out of the Visitors' book the following *poëmatia*, written by Paley's own hand not very long before.'

ἐνταυθοὶ νόσφ' πετριμμένος ἦν τις ὀδῖτης
ἔλθῃ, ἢ στυγερῶ πένθει τηρόμενος,
τῶνδ' ὕλης ἐκάνεισι καὶ ἄρτιμελῆς ἀπὸ χώρων,
καὶ νόον ἐκ δακρύων τρέψει ἐν εὐπλίην,
ὦδε γὰρ αἰὲν ἔχεις ἔσρος πολυανθέος ὥρη,
ὦδε πῶν ζήεις αἰθέρα λαμπρότατον.

Venimus huc, vernos cum spirans blanda per agros
Panderet aura tuas, insula dives, opes:
Venimus—et scopulos requievimus inter et umbras,
Eginus et laetos non sine sole dies.
O fortunatos, quies sors hic degere vitam,
Inque tuo, felix terra, jacere sinu.
Hic praesens Deus est, loquitur Natura; jugorum
Culmina respondent, hic manifestus adest.

F. A. P.

ERNST VON LEUTSCH.

THE death of Professor von Leutsch which, it will be remembered, occurred in the summer of 1887, has caused the *Philologischer Anzeiger* to be discontinued. The last number, which completes Vol. xvii., appropriately ends with a monograph on the venerable scholar from the pen of Dr. Max Schneidewin, his successor in the editorship of the *Philologus*, and son of Professor F. W. Schneidewin, the founder of that periodical. The following is an abstract:—

Ernst Ludwig von Leutsch was born on August 16, 1808, at Frankfurt-on-Main, where his father was at that time Saxon ambassador. After removing to Dresden and thence to Leipzig, his father settled finally at Celle as member of the Supreme Court of Appeal (*Oberappellationsgerichts-rath*) under the Hanoverian government.

E. v. Leutsch entered in his nineteenth year at the University of Göttingen, where he studied under

Mitscherlich, Dissen, and Otfried Müller, while among his friends as fellow-students were numbered L. Ahrens, C. L. Grotefend, F. W. Schneidewin and A. Geffers, a special bond of union being the 'philologische Gesellschaft' they formed among themselves. In this the discussions were held in Latin: the favourite subjects were the Cyclic and Hesiodic fragments, whence the thesis—*Thebaidos Cycliae Reliquiae*—on which Leutsch graduated (1830). The following session saw Leutsch at Berlin where he studied under A. Böckh. In 1831 he returned to Göttingen as *privatdozent*. His breadth of study is shown by his propounding and upholding no fewer than sixty theses, on July 6, 1833, for the post of 'assessor' to the classical faculty. He became extraordinary professor, May 2, 1837, and regular professor, with F. W. Schneidewin, in 1842, on the demand of K. F. Hermann, who before accepting a

professorship at Göttingen stipulated that Leutsch and Schneidewin should receive a similar honour. During the long vacation of 1842, the two colleagues visited Avranches, in Normandy, to collate a MS. of Cicero's *Orator* and *De Oratore*. The fruits of this expedition did not appear till 1857 (in *Philol.* vol. xi.) after Schneidewin's death (1856). The rest of his life presents few incidents. In his latter years his eyes were severely affected and he had to undergo three operations; the last in March 1887, only four months before his death. His death, on July 28, 1887, was sudden in the extreme: a first stroke of paralysis was followed in less than half an hour by a second and fatal one.

The work of his life lay in his academic duties. The extensive range of subjects covered by his lectures, is remarkable. Pindar, Aristophanes, Thucydides, Livy, and Tacitus (*Histories*), were his favourite subjects, but he also lectured on the Elegiac poets, Sophocles, Euripides, Theophrastus, Cicero, Horace, Catullus, Propertius, and Sallust. The length of his introductory remarks and the frequency of his digressions made it impossible for any but the shorter subjects to reach completion. His published works are insignificant beside his professorial labours, but include the following:—*Grundriss zu Vorlesungen über metrik* (1841), *Corpus Pseudoepigraphorum Graecorum* (1839, 1851), *Ovidius in Ersch and*

Grüber's Encyclopaedia (1836), and *Indices Scholarum* (six on Pindar) (1859—1869), and further, contributions to periodical literature, especially of course the *Philologus*.

The editorship of this, and of its supplement the *Philologischer Anzeiger*, formed no slight part of his work. He became editor of the *Philologus* in 1856 on the death of Prof. Schneidewin. The *Philologischer Anzeiger* he himself originated in 1868, despite the labour involved by the mass of material which the high reputation of the older periodical brought upon him. The merits of these two publications are sufficiently proved by the number of similar enterprises which have since been started.

Truthful and ingenious, his popularity suffered from the candid criticism which he never spared the students with whom he came in contact. His religious principles were deep and fervent: his bodily health he preserved carefully, walking and swimming being his regular exercise. A source of great enjoyment lay in his garden, which he aimed at making a practical illustration of classical botany. He left a classical library which for extent and completeness could not be equalled among the private libraries of Germany. 'A true example of German erudition, and a mind wedded to knowledge, have departed in Ernst von Leutsch.'

ARCHAEOLOGY.

Bibliothèque des Monuments Figurés Grecs et Romains. Voyage Archéologique en Grèce et en Asie Mineure de M. PHILIPPE LE BAS. Planches commentées par SALOMON REINACH. Paris. F. Didot et Cie. 1888.

SELDOM has any single person undertaken such a gigantic task as M. Reinach begins with this admirable volume, and in the present state of classical study it would not be easy to suggest any scheme that would be more widely useful. A *corpus* of the remains of ancient art, engraved in the excellent style of this specimen volume, and published at a moderate price! Such a series of volumes will open the path of study and research to many scholars in many departments from which they are at present practically debarred by the exorbitant price of the necessary books. There are a few dozen fundamental and indispensable archaeological works of great size and vast price, without which independent investigation in numerous subjects of art, antiquities, and literature in the style demanded by modern requirements is absolutely impossible; and I do not know that there is any place in Great Britain besides London, Oxford, and Cambridge where general access can be had to them.

Even those who spend their lives within

easy reach of such works as the *Monumenti Inediti* and the great collections of vase-paintings and reliefs, but who are unable to possess private copies of them, have often to waste much time in hunting up the copies in a public library; but still they are lucky in comparison with those who never have access to them at all except during occasional visits to one of the three scholars' libraries of Britain. It is the exception to find a page of a book on a subject either archaeological or lying on the border-land between literature and art, in which some monument published in the *Monumenti Inediti* is not touched on: one ought to have the illustration at hand at the moment, but is obliged to put off till the next day or the next month or the next year. M. Reinach quotes the saying of Gerhard: 'He who has seen one monument, has seen nothing: he who has seen a thousand of them, has seen one.' It is however almost equally true that you must see the same monument a thousand times: you must not merely see it once a year in a hurried vacation excursion, but you must also have a representation of it constantly beside you to study and examine in every mood and state of feeling, and especially when you are under the immediate influence of some luminous idea which has just occurred spontaneously or by suggestion

to your mind. M. Reinach as editor and Messrs. Firmin Didot et C^{ie} as publishers propose to bring the great archaeological books within the reach both of every provincial library and of an enormously wider circle of private buyers; and we can only add the hope that the sale of the first volumes may be such as to encourage the editor and publishers to carry out the project rapidly. The *Monumenti Inediti*, the plates of the *Annali dell' Istituto*, and that almost inaccessible work, *Antiquités du Bosphore Cimmérien*, are promised among the first: may we add a hope for the equally inaccessible plates of the *Comptes Rendus* of St. Petersburg. The right of reproducing the first of these has been already granted, and would probably be granted in other cases also.

M. Reinach explains clearly his reasons for adopting this bibliographical method of republication. We think there can be no doubt that he is right. Continuity in the method of reference is quite necessary: everybody refers to the volumes of the *Monumenti* for any monument which has been published there, and it is hopeless to supersede this by any less clumsy method. We want the republished volumes at our hand in reading the books which have been already published, and which use the conventional way of reference, and moreover all those who already possess or enjoy ready access to the folios of the *Monumenti* will continue to make their references to them. Any more ambitious scheme of reforming the methods of reference would be foredoomed to failure.

M. Reinach promises also to replace the previous drawings, in case of inexactness, by new drawings, and to accompany the plates with *commentaires très sobres*, in which the long original articles that discussed the plates will be summarized, any doubts which arise as to the genuineness of the monuments will be stated, and all restorations will be indicated. We hope that the desire to carry out this part too thoroughly may not unduly retard the completion of a design which, if executed promptly, promises to be of incalculable usefulness to ancient scholarship and research.

No one will blame the patriotic feeling which makes M. Reinach open the series with the work of a fellow-countryman, Philippe Le Bas, whose early death has left his great *Voyage Archéologique* a torso, subsequently only half finished by other hands. The plates intended for this book were published

only in part; many, which were never actually put in sale, were prepared and are here reproduced. Copies of the numerous folios of which the original work is composed are rare, and frequently fall short of the total amount that was actually published. There can be no doubt that the republication is an important service to archaeology, as well as a pious duty to an excellent traveller who fully deserved the high reputation he enjoys; though perhaps the volume cannot equal the importance of one which, as we may hope, will contain several volumes of the *Monumenti Inediti*. Many of the plates are of great importance and interest, and they are accompanied by a commentary containing a wonderfully rich series of references to the authorities who have treated the subject of the plates. This wealth of knowledge and of reference is one of the remarkable features in all M. Reinach's work, and I think that any one who examines critically a few of the paragraphs in this commentary will convince himself that the references represent the result of much genuine work, and are decidedly richer than anything of the same kind that has been done before. Many of these paragraphs must have cost the writer a great deal of independent research even to identify the subject. I have gone over those which relate to Asia Minor, and may add here the few corrections which I have to make. In *Mon. Figurés*, pl. 134, figs. 4 and 6, which come from Ameth and Assarlar, should not be classed along with figs. 1, 3 and 5, which belong to Hadriani, but with the monument of pl. 135 I, which belongs to Erigueuz. Assarlar and Ameth are villages a little further up the river than Erigueuz, and both are even further away than Erigueuz is from Hadriani. The remains of Erigueuz (*i.e.* Egri Geuz 'Squint Eye'), Ameth, and Assarlar belong to the Phrygian city of Tiberiopolis (see my *Cities and Bishoprics*, § CII.).

In *Mon. Fig.*, pl. 130 II., M. Reinach is at a loss to explain the occurrence of a relief representing a woman alone on the tomb of a man. The fact is that these Phrygian and Bithynian reliefs were not made to order, but were kept in stock by the stone-masons, and it is not rare to find an utter want of correspondence between the epitaph and the sculpture, owing to the carelessness or ignorance of the surviving relatives.

In *Mon. Fig.*, pl. 137, Guelde is confused with Goerdis (or, approximating nearer to the modern pronunciation, Giordiz), the site of the ancient Julia Gordus. Guelde is a village near Koula, and close to Sandal, the

latter of which preserves the name of the ancient Lydian bishopric Satala on the Hermus. In his remarks on the preceding plate, 136, M. Reinach follows the current identification of Koula with the ancient Koloe. The stele with the name Koloe was brought to Koula from a great distance: Koula is a purely modern city with a good Turkish name, by which it is known to the late Byzantine writers. It is situated in the territory of the ancient Satala (see my *Cities and Bishoprics*, § CVII.).

The volume before us contains 309 plates, many of which are of double size. They represent subjects of all kinds, sculptural, architectural, views and plans. Of many of these subjects representations are to be found only in the pages of Lebas. The plans of such places as Erythrae and Gythion have a special importance, as they were made before the extension of the modern towns began to obliterate or modify some of the features. More than 200 of the plates belong to Greece and the islands; the rest belong to Asia Minor and chiefly to the coast-lands.

Personally I have so much to gain from a speedy continuation of the series that I might suspect myself of selfishness in recommending it very strongly, but the same reasons which will make the volumes so useful to me equally apply to a thousand other students, who will find that it places within their reach departments of study which are now absolutely closed to them.

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE STAGE IN THE GREEK THEATRE.

In Dr. Hager's article on A. Müller's *Gr. Bühnenalterthümer* in the *Review* for December 1887 there is a notice of Dörpfeld's communication on the results of his work at the Dionysiac theatre. Prof. Jebb adds an appendix in which he mentions some cases in which these conclusions are corroborated by literary evidence. It is to be hoped we may have at some time a more complete collection of the evidence contributed by the dramas themselves. The architectural facts, as elucidated by Dörpfeld, promise to demolish much in the traditional views on the Greek theatre: what is now wanted is a knowledge of the degree to which his explanation agrees with the dramatic situation as we know them in the extant plays.

The points which Dörpfeld regards as established by the recent excavations at Athens and Epidauros are the following:—

1. The orchestra was originally a complete

circle: at Epidauros the stone bounding-ring which defined it still exists complete.

2. The only building, or raised masonry of any kind, in the space usually assumed for the stage in the Dionysiac theatre is the back wall, with projecting towers at either end, that served to carry the movable scenery. This wall is at a distance of sixteen feet from the circumference of the orchestra. In this narrow space, reduced still further by the scenery, must have stood the 'stage.'

In the second century B.C. the movable scenery in the theatres both of Athens and Epidauros was replaced by an Ionic façade, all the background that was needed for the street scenes of later comedy. The façade was built in front of the wall mentioned above, at a still nearer distance (four feet) from the orchestra.

3. There was only one door in the back wall, at exactly the level of the floor of the orchestra; an actor entering through it stepped immediately into the orchestra.

4. The remains of a raised stage are in no case earlier than Roman times (Nero?); the stage of Phaedrus, in fact, so familiar a feature in the views of the Dionysiac theatre, is as late as the third century, A.D.

The conclusion, which he bases on this architectural evidence are: (1) the action took place not on a raised stage, but in a part of the orchestra. (2) the *πάροδοι* served for the entrance alike of the public into the theatre, and of the chorus and actors represented as coming from a distance into the orchestra.

Scholars who are neither architects nor able themselves to visit the excavated theatres must be largely guided by the literary evidence. It is worth noticing that there is no word in classical Greek distinctly denoting 'stage.' *σκηνή* is originally the tent, afterwards the building into which an actor retired; in all cases in which the word occurs it can be probably explained without requiring the assumption of a raised stage in a permanent building: *λογεῖον* is not earlier than Roman times: of *ὀρεῖβας* the meaning is too uncertain to be of use in the argument: it undoubtedly denoted something raised, but more than that we cannot say. It is not of course contended that there was no raised place from which an actor could speak: instances of that are common enough, the Pnyx in the *Knights* (149, 751) the house of Euripides in the *Acharnians* (409), but these are scenery, not stage.

To the passage in the *Oed. Col.* referred to by Prof. Jebb I would add from the same

play the entrance of Ismene. She enters riding (313), attended by one servant. On the old theory she either rides on to the narrow space that is left for the stage, in which the fourteen lines (310—323) during which Antigone speculates whether the figure in the distance is her sister lose all their point, or, after dismounting, she mounts, *coram populo*, the steps connecting the orchestra with the stage. On Dörpfeld's theory the situation is perfectly simple; she enters as an actor coming from Boeotia would do through the *πάροδος*, she meets her father and sister in the orchestra, where Antigone is standing when, later in the play, she is dragged off, as Prof. Jebb points out, through the *πάροδος* by Kreon's servants. In many plays it is clear that actors and chorus must have been within arm's length of one another. In the *Acharnians*, for instance, Dicaeopolis retires through the door in the back scenes (*εἰσιὼν*, l. 202) and returns, l. 241, and at l. 281 he is within striking distance of the chorus, near enough at least to make him fear for the safety of his pots (284). Similarly in the *Frogs*, Dionysus' appeal to his priest (297) is rather pointless if there is an orchestra sixty feet in diameter separating them.

One of the clearest cases is from the *Agamemnon*. We talk of Greek tragedy as 'statuesque,' and are too ready to deny it any of our own taste for scenic pageantry. Agamemnon returns as a conqueror in his chariot with Cassandra beside him. He would have made but a sorry entrance had he come directly on to the 'stage.' It is quite different if he entered through the *πάροδος* with his train of soldiers and captives. The lines of anapaests, 782—809, are the natural metre for the movement of the chorus as it meets and makes way for the great procession sweeping round the orchestra till it reaches the front of the palace. Then follows the dialogue with Clytemnestra and at last he descends from his car and walks over the purple carpet to the palace, but there is nothing whatever to suggest that there were stairs to mount or a stage to cross to reach it.

J. S. FURLEY.

ACQUISITIONS OF BRITISH MUSEUM.

1. *a.* Hand-made vase of very archaic pottery nearly cylindrical in form, *ht.* 7½ in. Round the neck is moulded a collar on which are three loops for suspension. On the body are two pinched-out rudimentary handles, ornamented on the upper surface with incised cross-hatching. From a tomb in Antiparos.

b. Three fragments of obsidian knives from the island of Sirina, (see *C. R. ante.*, p. 329).

2. *a.* A bronze cylindrical object which has probably formed the knob at the end of a staff.

b. A vase of red clay with wavy decorations in black.

Both from Mr. G. Dennis' excavations at the tumuli Bintepe near Sardes (see *C. R. ante.*, p. 329).

3. Plasma intaglio, contest of Herakles and Acheloos, in the presence of Deianeira: Herakles in the lionskin swings his club against a bearded, man-faced bull which seems to fall forward; Deianeira stands in the foreground beside Acheloos, with both arms raised. Mr. Murray remarks 'this attitude answers to the phrase *ἐκτεταγμένη φάβη* with which she describes herself in the *Trachiniae* of Sophocles, v. 19. The same subject is mentioned as having been sculptured on the throne of Apollo at Amyklæ (Pausanias III, 18, 15), the date of which falls in the first half of the sixth century B.C. To that date also may be assigned this gem. It has been published in King's *Antique Gems* II, pl. 34, fig. 3, and is a most interesting example of archaic gem-engraving. The stone, a plasma, is extremely rare in early art. The cable border would indicate that the gem was originally in the form of a scarab, the back having been cut in subsequent times.'

4. Onyx Cameo, representing a bust of Caracalla, found near Verona. The back has been left in the rough, showing the method of cutting.

5. Bronze mirror case, found some years ago in Corinth: on the outside of the case is attached a relief representing an Eros with two girls, a group which Mr. Murray thinks may be that of Eros assisting Phaedra to unveil herself, to the horror of her nurse. The scene would thus correspond with the interview between Phaedra and the nurse as given in the *Hippolytos* of Euripides, the actual moment being that (v. 352) when the nurse discovers that it is Hippolytos whom Phaedra loves. As on the bronze the figure beside Phaedra is more youthful in appearance than would be expected in the nurse, she may perhaps represent one of the chorus of women who were equally amazed at this discovery.

On the inside of the mirror case is incised a very beautiful design of a nymph seated on a bench and playing with Pan at a game resembling the Italian morra: an Eros is beside the nymph. The bench on which she sits may be supposed to be a fountain, as the presence of a swan under it would suggest. The meeting of Pan and a nymph at a fountain would also be consistent with Greek mythology.

6. Marble head of Tiberius, life size, from Rome: an excellent example of Roman portraiture.

6. A series of twenty-one moulds for terra-cottas, from Tarentum.

ARRANGEMENT.

The galleries of antiquities are undergoing a series of changes which it is hoped will enhance the interest of the collections and give improved facilities for study. On the upper floor, the new Terra-cotta room is now completed, and the First Bronze Room is being converted into a Fourth Vase Room, so that the collection of painted vases will now be exhibited in an unbroken series. In the old Fourth Vase Room, which from its shape is well suited to a miscellaneous collection, will be arranged the miscellaneous objects in bronze other than those of a purely artistic character, such as armour, utensils, cistae, &c.: as well as other collections of a miscellaneous character such as ambers and ivories. The principal collection will be Etruscan, and the room will in future be known as the 'Etruscan Saloon.'

On the lower floor, the Elgin Room has now been almost cleared of everything which does not belong to the special period of and following the Parthenon; and by the rearrangement of the Pediments a large portion of the frieze is now seen from a better point of view. The Archaic Room has likewise been weeded, and the Branchidae figures are now grouped at the west end, as a *dromos* between the two adjacent saloons: while in the Third Graeco-Roman Saloon a corner has been made for archaistic sculpture.

selected somewhat at random; the red-figured being, for instance, very scantily represented in comparison with the earlier and later. The reproductions look pretty, but are far from being stylistically satisfactory, and the majority are reduced copies of illustrations already published.

Such shortcomings however are not likely to be a drawback to the general reader, who will find that the work makes no demands for a special knowledge of art, archaeology, or mythology, and that it is written in an easy and graceful style. Indeed, if we mistake not, it is in these respects the only book of its kind.

W. C. F. ANDERSON.

THE AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES AT ATHENS.—The seventh year of the American School at Athens opened on October 1st in the new building, which is for the first time the home of the School, although the books of the library had been there for several months, and some of the students had their quarters there for a few weeks in the spring.

Dr. Waldstein had accepted the invitation to become Director of the School, on condition that the fund for its permanent endowment should be secured by August 1st, 1888. This condition was not fulfilled, and the School loses the advantage of his constant presence and oversight. He consents, however, to direct and advise in the conduct of the School so far as his English engagements permit, spending some weeks in Athens during the winter, and expecting to go to Greece again in the spring. This arrangement is a compromise and only temporary. The friends of the School are confident that the permanent fund will be secured before the beginning of another year.

The details of the work of the School for this year are in the hands of the Annual Director, Professor Frank B. Tarbell, who was for eleven years instructor in Greek in Yale College, and is admirably fitted for his duties.

Six students are enrolled as members of the School this year. Two of these spent last year also in Greece.—Mr. Carl D. Buck of Yale College, the fortunate leader of the excavations at Icaria last winter, and Mr. D. Quinn of St. Mary's College. Two of the new members of the School are young ladies, graduates of Wellesley College—Miss Norcross and Miss Slater.

Histoire de la Céramique Grecque, par OLIVIER RAYET et MAXIME COLLIGNON. Pp. xvii + 417. Paris, 1888.

This work, with its fine paper, large margins, and wide-spaced type, is evidently intended rather for the *dilettante* and general reader than the student.

The bulk of the text is by M. Rayet, but his sad death in February, 1887, left it incomplete. The plan adopted is to give a general sketch of the political and social forces at work during the different periods into which he divided vase-painting and, this done, to describe in graceful terms a few picked vases illustrating the characteristics of each period.

M. Collignon has left the text unaltered and has added a preface and chapters on the Corinthian *pinakes*, the vases in relief, South Italian pottery, moulded and enamelled ware and architectural terra-cottas. It is however in many ways a pity that he did not see fit to annotate if not revise the earlier chapters, for since Furtwängler and Loeschcke's work has come out and since this year's discoveries on the Acropolis, they are quite out of date.

The illustrations are numerous and include sixteen coloured plates. The vases illustrated are for the most part already known, and seem to have been

Revue Archéologique, July—August, 1888. Paris.

2. de Vaux: an account of the excavations by the Dominicans at Jerusalem: they found a group of tombs probably of early date, and remains probably of the basilica built by Eudoxia in honour of St. Stephen: two plates, four cuts. 3. de Jubainville: Herodotus puts the source of the Danube in the Pyrenees, because he disbelieved the existence of Hyperboreans and the Rhipæan mountains. 5. Maître: resemblance between certain bronze swords and the swordfish: cut and plate. 6. Le Blant: ancient ideas of the power and charms that lay in the hair of a woman. 7. Cumont: cult of Mithras at Edessa: Aziz and Monimos = Phosphorus and Hesperos, and the 'Helios' of Jamblichus = Mithras.

Reviews: Rayet's 'Céramique.'

C. S.

The same, September—October, 1888. Paris.

1. d'Arbois de Jubainville: the use of bracelets, etc., as purchase money in ancient Ireland: the introduction of the balance came probably from the Romans in Britain. 2. Cumont: the taurobolium, usually referred to the cult of Cybele, is really connected with Anahita. 3. Lebégue: notes on certain Latin inscriptions of the Narbonne district. 4. Mowat: the sculptor of the Chercell statue (*ante*, x. p. 370) is not Myrisus, but Myrismus. 5. de la Blanchère: the inscriptions of Djebel Toumat. 6. Delattre, excavation of a Roman cemetery at Carthage: in this necropolis (second cent. A.D.) a curious method of burial occurs; the ashes within the cippus are placed in a pierced urn, which communicates with the outside by means of a sloping channel: down this channel the offerings to the manes, or other ashes, were poured. One body was buried in plaster. Among other objects, about forty leaden dirae and 289 epitaphs were found: forty-seven epitaphs are here given, fifty marks on lamps, marks on pottery and bricks, a short note of coins, and a specimen of a leaden dira: five cuts. 7. Deloche: seals and rings of the Merovingian period, continued. 9. Monceaux: annals of the Thessalian league, continued: considers (i) the protectorate of Philip II; (ii) Thessaly under the strategia of the kings of Macedon. 10. de Lessert: the formula *translata de sordentibus locis* (Chercell) refers to statues removed from pagan temples after the triumph of Christianity; those which were still objects of cult were deposited at Chercell *sub officio*. 11. Tannery: on abbreviations in Greek MSS. 12. Reinach's *Chronique d'Orient*: principally an account by Ramsay of his last journey in Asia Minor.

Reviews: Fontenay's 'Bijoux Anciens': Tischler's Ostpreussische Grabbügel: and Epigraphical publications relating to Roman antiquity, by Cagnat, continued.

C. S.

'Εφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική, 1887. Part 4. Athens.

1. Tsountas : antiquities from Mykenae discovered in the excavations of 1886 : including two inscriptions, a series of most interesting wall paintings (three coloured plates), and a number of miscellaneous objects in ivory, bronze, etc. (plate). 2. Philios : four honorary decrees from Eleusis. 3. Koumanoudes : two inscriptions from Priene. 4. Nikolaides : Homeric illustrations of the scene on the Boeotian cup published 'Εφ. 1887, pl. 5, 2. 5. Lolling : notes on the topography of Megaris. 6. Koumanoudes : three fragments of Attic decrees, and a fragment of a Roman inscription found in Athens. C. S.

Gazette Archéologique, Nos. 9-10, 1888. Paris.

1. Six : vases of the archaic period with polychrome decoration on a black ground : two plates, four cuts. 2. Deglane : the palace of the Caesars on the Palatine, concluded : four plates, one cut. 3. Collignon : funerary plaques of painted terra-cotta : probably formed part of the decoration of the sarcophagus : they represent all the different acts of the funeral ceremony : one plate, one cut. 6. Vercoutre : a

potsherd from Soussa with bilingual graffito, Latin and neo-Punic : two cuts.

Reviews : Fontenay's 'Bijoux Anciens' : Richter's 'Die Spiele der Gr. u. Röm.' C. S.

Annuaire de la Société française de Numismatique, Sept.—Oct. 1888.

A. De Belfort, 'Imperial Roman Coins not described in Cohen's work' (continued). Descriptions of Coins of the Emperors from Carus to Diocletian.—Review : A. De Barthélemy's 'Légendes des monnaies gauloises,' by R. S.—Remarks on the Quelen sale of Roman coins.

The Numismatic Chronicle, vol. viii. 3rd series, part 3, 1888.

Graetz, 'On the Jewish "Lulab" and "Portal" Coins.'—Sir A. Cunningham, 'Coins of the Indo-Scythians.'

Revue belge de Numismatique, volume for 1888
H. Schuermans, 'Un revers des médailles de Dioclétien.' W. WROTH.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Transactions of the American Philological Association for 1887. Vol. xviii. Boston, 1888.

The Monetary Crisis in Rome, A.D. 33, W. F. Allen. An explanation of Tac. *Ann.* vi. 16, 17 by the help of Suet. *Tib.* 48 and Dio C. 58, 21. The law of the Dictator Caesar (*de modo credendi possidendique*) which was revived is that referred to by Dio 41, 38 and 58, 21. *Vetita versura*, what was forbidden was not 'compound interest' [see C.R. ii. 217b] but 'loans on interest,' i.e. not interest as such, but the trade of money-lending. The relief measure, viz. that the debtor should pay two-thirds of his debt down, and the creditor invest this two-thirds in land (Suet. *Tib.* 48), leaving the balance on for eighteen months, was in a sense a general foreclosure of mortgages by summary process. If a comma only is put after *condiderant* and a full stop after *provocebantur*, so that *quia* refers to two clauses instead of one, the reason of the failure of the scheme is plain. The purpose of the money-lenders was not merely to hoard up money for the purpose of land, but 'to buy up large estates when prices should touch bottom,' and so they refused to buy the portions of estates which the debtors desired to sell.

The Tradition of Caesar's Gallic Wars from Cicero to Orosius, by E. G. Sihler. In the absence of an exhaustive discussion of the subject, the writer takes up in chronological order the notices and accounts of the Gallic war that are found in later classical authors. His purpose was to ascertain the manner of reproduction, the additions and the critical bias or purpose of the various authors. In Livy, *Periocha* ciii., he proposes the reading *Narbonensem* for *Narbonem*. Suetonius, influenced probably by Asinius Pollio, is very unfavourable to Caesar. Julius Florus shows a rhetorical bias that vitiates his account, and in some instances glaring invention. Dio Cassius in some cases of precise detail, e.g. Caesar's cipher, used special sources. The transcript of Orosius ranks high.

On the Relative Value of the MSS. of Terence, E.

M. Pease. An elaborate comparison of the eight chief MSS. of Eunuchus and Adelphoi, of four of Phormio, and three of Andria, in respect of omissions, insertions, variations of spelling, changes of case, number, &c. The writer, taking as a standard Umpfenbach's division into three groups, viz. A (Bembinus), D. G. (Victorinus, Decurtatus), and PCBEF (Parisinus, Vaticanus, Basilicanus, Riccardianus, Ambrosianus), concludes from his tables that PCB excel DG and rank next in value to A, and that EF are so loosely connected with PCB that they may almost be regarded as a fourth group. While in age D and P are about equal, more changes have been made in the archetype of the D family than in the archetype of the P family, and more afterwards came into its individual MSS.

Conditional Sentences in Aischylos, E. B. Clapp. The writer takes Prof. Gildersleeve's division of conditional sentences into Logical, Anticipatory, Ideal, and Unreal, which correspond to Prof. Goodwin's Present and Past particular, Vivid Future, Vague Future, and Present and Past unfulfilled suppositions respectively. The generic conditions are treated separately. Logical conditions are more than 60 p.c. of the whole. There is no ground for concluding that εἰ with fut. indic. is minatory in tone. The anticipatory conditions are only 9 p.c. The use of εἰ with the subj. is almost confined to generic suppositions as in Pindar. Ideal conditions are 19 p.c. We cannot get beyond Goodwin's distinction between them and the anticipatory. There are only eleven cases of the unreal condition, and only seven of generic conditional sentences, Aisch. being much fonder of the hypothetical relative sentence to express general ideas. The last-named class of sentences is common, the anticipatory being thirty-four, and generic relative twenty-four. Conditional participles are also frequent, Aisch. usually making them equivalent to an ideal condition. There are also one hundred and twenty-five cases of the potential optative, and ten of the potential indicative.

H. W. Smyth makes an important contribution to

Greek dialectology in his exhaustive paper upon the *Arado-Cyprian Dialect*. Reviewed above by C. E. Bennett, pp. 48 ff.

In the Report of the Annual Session are summaries of the following papers: *Grote on Thuc.* vi. 17 (*ἀνέπιστοι*), W. S. Scarborough. *ἀν.* is neut. when applied to things, and active when applied to persons. *Aeschines' Reticence*, R. B. Richardson. The silence of Aesch. upon *Dem. de Cor.* §§ 129, 130, strengthens the view of those who believe that he published exactly what he spoke. He could not when speaking have foreseen this abuse. *The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (second paper), an attempt to prove on linguistic grounds that St. Luke is the author. *The Cunn-contractions in Latin*, W. G. Hale. *Some peculiarities of Diction and Syntax in Cicero's De Legibus*, W. A. Merrill. A list of exceptional usages of grammar and diction. *Ancipiti in Caes. B.G.* i. 26, W. S. Scarborough. *Ancipiti* means doubtful, not double, both on ground of etymology and the context.

Journal of Philology, Vol. XVII. No. 34. This is a very strong number, containing at least three contributions of first-rate importance for the determination of the text of Latin poets, viz. 40 pages of 'Catulliana' by J. P. Postgate, 17 pages of 'Horatiana' by A. E. Housman, and the 'Pervigilium Veneris' by J. W. Mackail; two interesting papers on 'Plato,' one by D. D. Heath on the 'Cratylus,' the other by S. H. Butcher on the 'Geometrical Problem of the Meno'; a careful examination of the accounts of Caesar's 'Expedition to Britain' by H. E. Malden, and an ingenious attempt to get rid of the difficulties in 'Hor. Od. iv. 8' by A. W. Verrall. The remaining articles consist of emendations in the 'Aetna' by R. Unger, and in the 'Histories of Tacitus' by J. H. Onions; notes on 'Laedere Numen and Lucan iii. 559' by H. Nettleship; on 'Roman remains in Krain, Croatia and Serbia' by F. Havelfield; and an examination by J. S. Reid of the 'Merton Codex of Cicero' for the portion of the 'De Divinatione' which it contains.

Athenaeum: 24 Nov. 1888: notice of 'Guide-Joanne to Athens and Attica.' 8 Dec. notices of Capes' 'Achaean League according to Polybius.' 15 Dec. review of Paley's 'Fragments of Greek Comic Poets' and obituary notice of Prof. Paley. 29 Dec. notices of 'Stephenson's Vergil Aen. IV.' Page's 'Aen. VI.' etc. 5 Jan. 1889: notices of the 'Eton Horace' Maguire's 'Tac. Ann. I.' and Dowdall's 'Livy XXII.'

Academy: 1 Dec. 1888: Review of Mommsen's 'Der Senat' by F. T. Richards. 8 Dec. and 15 Dec. letters from J. E. B. Mayor on the Latin 'Heptapla.'

The Expositor. Nos. 43-48 (July to December, 1888). In Nos. 43-45 F. Rendall continues and brings to an end his corrections of the R. V. for the *Acha.* In 43 Archdeacon Farrar defends Dr. Abbott's theory of the connexion between Josephus and the 2nd Ep. of St. Peter against Dr. Salmon. In 45 W. A. Simcox, writing on the Pauline *Antilegomena*, points out resemblances between St. Luke's writings, the Pastoral Epistles and the *Hebrews*, but arrives at no definite conclusion. In Nos. 46 and 48 W. M. Ramsay on 'Early Christian Monuments in Phrygia' calls attention to the difference between the Christian inscriptions found in the north-west bordering on the flourishing Church of Bithynia and those of the south; the former openly professing, the latter more or less concealing the religious opinions of the writers, the former being found in country districts, the latter in the towns. The earliest date from the beginning of the third century, and the Greek, especially in the

north, is often very debased. Formulas of common occurrence on the tombstones are: 'A Christian to a Christian'; and (as a warning against desecrating the tomb) 'Thou shalt not wrong God,' 'If any stranger bury here he shall have to reckon with God.' The Christian communities seem to have obtained legal recognition under the form of burial societies, which are alluded to under various names, e.g. 'The neighbours of the First Gate.' A curious phrase occurring on an inscription of about 200 A.D. is (*ἡ προεδρία τῶν πορφυροβαφῶν*), which is supposed to mean 'purple dyers' for outsiders, but 'washed in blood' for the initiated. We find mention of presbyters (also disguised under the term *γεραιός*), laity, virgins, *κοιμητήριον*. Purely biblical names are not found till the middle of the fourth century. In No. 47 W. Sanday writes on 'Early Christian Organization.' In 48 R. G. Balfour on *Heb.* vi. 1, 2 explains *βαπτισμῶν διδασχῆς ἐπιθέσεως τε χειρῶν* as a parenthesis in apposition to the preceding *μετανοίας καὶ πίστεως*, and thinks the reference is to the scape-goat and the ablutions of the Jewish law.

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie u. Pädagogik. Ed. Fleckeisen u. Masius. 1888.

Heft 8 contains: (1) K. Brandt, *Ueber das 18te Buch der Ilias*, contending that 1-367 belong to the *μῆνις* and the rest, 368-617, is later.—(2) W. H. Roscher, *Der Kykeon des Hipponeux*, partly discussing the nature of a *κυκεών*, partly suggesting *πινῶν* for *πίνων* in Bergk. Fr. 43.—(3) O. Crusius, *Dion. Periegetes u. der Imbrische Hermesdienst*, a controversy with Unger.—(4) G. A. Unger, *Der Hyakinthienmonat*, shewing that the Spartan month Hyakinthion corresponded to Attic Thargelion (about May).—(5) P. Regell, *Zu Dion. Halic.*, contending (a) that *Ant. Rom.* II. 6 is a translation from some Latin writer, and (b) that II. 5, purporting to describe the *inauguratio* of Romulus is quite wrong.—(6) L. Sadée, *Zu Dion. Halic.*, a series of emendations.—(7) A. Weisze, *Zu Thukyd.*, explaining the appropriateness of *ἀνέθηκε* (rather than *καθίστασε*) in I. 13, 6, by ref. to III. 104, 2.—(8) E. Graf, *Zu Plutarchs Symposiaka*, emendations.—(9) A. Thimme, *Zwei Festvorlesungen des Lukianos*, explaining that *προλαλία δ' Ἀδώνιος* was meant as an introduction to Bk. II. of *Vera Historia*, just as the *προλαλία* 'Ἡρακλῆς introduced Book I.—(10) G. Faltin, *Zu Horatius Episteln*, a commentary on Ep. I. xi.—(11) C. John, *Zum Dialogus des Tacitus*, emendations.

Heft 9 contains: (1) H. Schrader, *Die hexametrischen Ueberschriften zu den 84 Homerischen Rhapsodien*, with an excursus on the dactylic verse of Theodorus Prodrömus and John Tzetzes.—(2) H. Draheim, *De hiatus debili qui dicitur Homericus*, classifying the instances and attempting to explain each class.—(3) G. Zippel, *Zu Diodoros*, suggesting in fr. xxxiv. 36 Ddf. *Κογκωνητιακός* for *Κορωνιασός*, and *Λακτάρας* for *Ιοντάρας*.—(4) E. Lammert, *Zu Polybios*, a long series of emendations.—(5) Th. Maurer, *Zu Verg. Aeneis*, very long notes on several passages.—(6) A. Müller, *Zu Aristophanes*, justifying from *Ravennas* the reading *ἐπ' ἐπ' ὅρται τ'* in *Ach.* 988.

Archiv für lateinische lexikographie u. grammatik ed. E. Wölfflin v. 2.

1. Landgraf, *substantivische Paratazen*: Exx. of substantives doubled to express some sort of reciprocity, *hominum inter homines societas, vir virum legit*. Two classes are distinguished, according as the second noun is joined to the first by case or by preposition. The latter is commonest in late Latin (*de loco in locum* &c.) and borrowed from Hebrew. The article concludes with a full list.—2. Schönwerth

and Weymann, *adjective auf -osus*, in four parts: (i) Derivation of suffix (cp. *Arch.* p. 368), traces of *-osus* (*formosus* found in Vergil, Ovid, Hor., Iuv. and even late writers) and of *-osus*. (ii) Formation, in Cic. mostly from nouns, in early and late Latin more extended but very few from verbs; *laboriosus curiosus* analogy of *gloriosus*. (iii) Sense (a) abundance of thing denoted; (b) like Grk. *-ωδης* e.g. *senex hircosus*. (iv) Index.—3. Additional notes on suffix *-o*, *-onis* (*Archiv.* v. 56-88).—4. Gröber, *vulgarlateinische Substrate*, *reburris* to *rutiliare*.—5. Lexicographical articles with 'Erläuterungen' (Plön, Schmalz, Miodoński) on *abripio* and derivatives, *abrado*, *abrogo*, *-atio*, *-ator*, *abrotunum*, *-onites*, *abrunpo*, *abruo*, *abrupte*, *-tio*, *-tum*, *-tus*, *abscedo*. [The form *abrunpito* quoted p. 265 from Fröhner's *Aecianus*, is wrong.] 5. Vignette notes are: *angustator* (Nettleship); *cultor*, *saturus* (Funck), on C.I.L. vii. 980, 78; *Culex* 140 (Ellis), read *fleta* for *laeta*: *vicens* (Stolz) &c.—6. *Miscellen*: e.g. *Tormenta* (Brandt), *Maenianum* (Sittl), *circa -um* (E. W.—7. Reviews: mainly on the usages of individual authors; biographies of Gerber and Ott; editorial notes. It appears that England subscribes for 21, America 14 copies of the *Archiv* out of 293.—F. H.

Philologischer Anzeiger, vol. xvii. pt. 12 contains:—

144. J. H. Schmidt, *Synonymik der griechischen Sprache*, IV. bd. (Cr.): 'Good, but lacks method.'—145. Th. Zielinski, *Quaestiones comicae* (W. Uckermann): Highly commended.—146. Martin Wohlrab, *Die Platonhandschriften und ihre gegenseitigen Beziehungen* (Leopold Cohn).—147. S. Lederer, *Eine neue Handschrift von Arrianus Anabasis* (M. Erdmann): 'Valueless.'—148. Egenolf, *Die orthoepischen Stücke der byzantinischen Literatur* (Georg Schoemann): Favourable.—149. R. Peiper, *Decimi Magni Ausonii Burdigalensis opuscula* (M. Petschenig): A list of passages criticised.—150. A. Fleckeisen, *Cornelii Nepotis vitae* (Post Carolum Halmium recognovit A. F.).—151. P. Dietrich, *Ueber die tendenz des Taciteischen Agricola*: 'Bad.'—152. Schwenkenbocher, *Quo anno Taciti dialogus de oratoribus habitus sit quaeritur*: 'Not proven.'—153. John, *Tacitus' Dialogus de oratoribus* cap. i.—xxvii. übersetzt und kritisch-exegetisch erläutert. The style of translation disapproved of.—154. J. A. Heikel, *Seneca's Charakter und politische Tätigkeit aus seinen Schriften beleuchtet* (K. J. N.): Agrees with conclusions.—155. Ae. Baehrens, *M. Minucii Felicis Octavius* (Th. Stangl): Unfavourable.—156. Eugen Oberhammer, *Akarnanien, Ambracia, Amphilochien, Leukas im Alterthum* (Cr.): 'Excellent.'—157. G. Oehmichen, *Griechischer Theaterbau nach Vitruv und den Überresten* (A. Müller): 'Welcome.'—158. A. Müller, *Bühnenalterthümer* [in Hermann's *Lehrbuch d. griech. ant.* III. 2] (J. Niejahr): 'Shows industry and contains much of value.'—159. O. Schulthess, *Vormundschaft nach attischem Recht* (K. Seeliger): 'Well treated.'—160. K. Häderli, *Die hellenischen Astynomen und Agoranomen, vornehmlich im alten Athen* (C. Schaefer): Defects noted.—161. H. C. Mané, *Der praefectus fabrum*: Favourable.—162. H. Matzat, *Kritische Zeittafeln für den Anfang des zweiten punischen Krieges* (W. Soltau): A systematic refutation.—163. Fr. Cauer, *De fabulis Graecis ad Romanum conditam pertinentibus* (M. Zoeller): 'Hardly sets the subject at rest.'—164. Fr. Cauer, *Die römische Aeneassage von Naevius bis Vergilius* (Id.): 'Observation and inference less uniformly keen.'

Excerpta.—*Nachträge*.—*Indices*.
Ernst von Leutsch, *Ein Nekrolog*, von Max Schneidewin (see p. 82).

Philologische Rundschau.

10. Müller, *L. Annaeus Seneca* (Krafft). Must supersede all previous editions. Bötticher, *die Akropolis von Athen* (Neuling). Deserves to rank with the Olympia of the same author. Thiancourt, *Étude sur la conjuration de Catilina de Salluste* (John). A pleasantly written pamphlet including the results of the more recent literature on the subject. Ascoli, *Sprachwissenschaftliche Briefe* (Stolz). A valuable addition to the stock of scientific knowledge. Hermann Camillo Kellner, *Savitrî* (Hansen). A complete and useful school edition with glossary.

11. Carlo Moratti, *Studi sulle antiche lingue italiane* (Pauli). Another attempt to explain the inexplicable. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte bis zu Chaeroneia*, 2nd Part (Bauer). On the same high level as the first part. Van Essen, *Index Thucydideus* (Sitzler). Complete and accurate but deficient in arrangement. Frigell, *Adnotationes ad Horatii Carmina* (Rosenberg). Contains many suggestive remarks, but hardly pays sufficient attention to previous editions. Mähly, *zur Kritik lateinischer Texte*. The suggestions are interesting like most by the same author. Roberts, *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy* (Meisterhans). Contains nothing new, but from its clear exposition of the more recent literature will prove useful. Tolesku, *Inscriptionen aus der Dobrudscha* (Meisterhans). Valuable both philologically and historically.

12. Schöll, *Plauti Rudens* (Mähly). The immense number of conjectural emendations is hardly reconcilable with the minute and anxious pains taken to reproduce the exact reading of the MSS. The great value of the work lies in the collection and sifting of all the recent Plautine literature. Curtius, *Griech. Schulgrammatik* (Bachof). Revised, and adapted to present wants by W. v. Hartel. Pauli, *Altitalische Studien*. Discusses the Corfinian Inscription and the Pelignian language, maintaining its close affinity with Oscan. Ivan Müller, *Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Vols. 8 and 9. (1) *Hommel, Abriss der Geschichte der vorderasiatischen Kulturvölker und Ägyptens bis auf die Zeit der Perserkriege* (Hansen). History of the Babylonians, Assyrians, Israelites, Hittites, Medes and Egyptians. It is perhaps rash to put the Babylonian Empire earlier than the Egyptian, and some other doubtful points seem to be stated too confidently. The sketch will be useful to general scholars, the conspectus of the literature to special students. (2) Lolling, *Hellenische Topographie* (Hansen). A vast amount of statistical and literary materials arranged with the greatest care and accuracy. (3) Pöhlman, *Grundzüge der politischen Geschichte Griechenlands* (Hansen). An excellent sketch of the political history of Greece till the time of its subjection to the Romans, including the Macedonian period.

13. Peppmüller, *Exercitationes criticae in poetis Graecis* (Sitzler). A large number of emendations, chiefly on Theognis, are examined in detail. Breidt, *De Aurelio Prudentio Horatii imitatore* (Petschenig). A list of the passages where Prudentius borrows from Horace. Schicke, *Ciceronis Tusculanae Disputationes* (Degenhart). The reviewer discusses the question of the date and many of the new readings introduced. G. Löscheke, *Boreas und Oreithya am Kypselo-kasten, Die westliche Giebelgruppe am Zeus-tempel zu Olympia* (Weiszäcker). Contains much that is interesting. Wheeler, *Analogy and its application to language* (Stolz). A clear and intelligible account of the different forms in which analogy influences language. Wagener, *Haupt-schwierigkeiten der lateinischen Formenlehre* (Schmalz). Indispensable to teachers.

14. Jebb, *Sophocles Antigone* (Müller). The critic discusses a number of debatable points in the intro-

duction and commentary, but finds that the textual criticism is on the whole thoughtful and careful, and that the edition is as important for the study of Sophocles as that of Dindorf was. Schanz, *Platonis Euthyphro* (Liebhold). A real service for the admirers of Plato. A large number of suggested readings are discussed. Wilhelm, *De Minucii Felicis Octavio et Tertulliani Apologetico* (Mohr). Discusses and finally settles the relation between the two works. Bergk, *Literaturgeschichte* (Kähler). Some points are open to dispute and the modern works on the subject are neglected. Still the editor deserves the thanks of the philological world. Wrobel, *Eberhardi Bethuniensis Græcismus* (Petschenig). The apparatus criticus is perhaps almost too full. On the whole a useful edition.

15. Holub, *Oedipus Tyrannus* (Müller). The critic opposes the suggestion that the Laurentian MS. was copied from dictation, and maintains that it is derived from an Uncial MS. of the 5th or 6th cent. Kurtz, *Miscellen zu Plutarchi Vitæ* (Stegmann). Warmly recommended to friends of Plutarch. Goetz, *Plauti Pseudolus* (Redslob). In the thirty-seven years since Ritschl's edition much progress has been made both in the collation of the MSS. and the criticism of the text, and Goetz has fully availed himself of the results. His arrangement of the Cantica is specially successful. The critic discusses and generally approves a large number of emendations. Merguet, *Lexikon zu den philosophischen Schriften Ciceros*, 1st part (Landgraf). Very complete and accurate though the arrangement leaves something to be desired. Haunsach, *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*, vols. iii. and iv. (Stolz). Vol. iii. contains the Inscriptions of Megara and its colonies Argosthona and Pagasis, Vol. iv. part of the Index. Birt, *Zwei politische Satiren des alten Rom* (Mähly). A comparison of the 26th book of Lucilius with the satire of Claudian on Eutropius. Several conjectures on Lucilius should be certain. Maschke, *Der Freiheitsprozess im klassischen Altertum* (Reitig). Contains remarks on (1) civil process at Rome, (2) process of liberation at Rome, (3) in Greece, (4) the Gortynian Inscription.

16. Schmelzer, *Sophokles Trachinierinnen* (Müller). Represents the play as based on the idea of jealousy. Emendation is carried to extremes. Hans Schmaus, *Tacitus ein Nachahmer Vergils* (Wolff). A fairly complete collection and arrangement of the imitations of Vergil in Tacitus. Konrad Müller, *Die Weltkarte des Castorius* (Weizsäcker). A careful reproduction of the facsimile of Scheyb, preceded by an introduction containing a valuable discussion of the age and accuracy of the copy, with an account of its history and of the different editions. Nebe, *De mysteriis Eleusiniarum tempore et administratione* (Sitzler). A careful and valuable discussion. *Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* Vol. i. part 1 (Achelis). Would extort respect even from those who despise histories of philosophy. Blase, *Geschichte des Irrealis im Lateinischen* (Ihm). The principle may be combated, but the work cannot fail to contribute to the elucidation of the hypothetical sentence in Latin.

17. Verrall, *Aeschylus Septem contra Thebas* (Wecklein). Both textual criticism and exegesis are marked by originality. There are many elegant and tasteful suggestions, but on the whole 'one could wish for less that is new, and more that is true.' Josephy, *Der oratorische Numa bei Isokrates und Demosthenes* (Fox). Does for Isokrates and Demosthenes what Wuest has done for Cicero. Heidenhain, *Die Arten der Tragödie bei Aristoteles* (Bullinger). Highly stimulating though mistaken in principle. Zingerle,

Livy, part 3, books xxi.—xxv (Hachtmann). The objections which the critic raises against points of detail do not in the least affect the general worth of the edition which will be of material help both to teachers and boys. Heydemann, *Dionysus' Geburt und Kindheit* (Meier). A collection of a large number of Dionysus groups not always well chosen.

18. Sidgwick, *Aeschylus Eumenides* (Birchmeyer). Textual criticism is conservative, the explanatory notes clear and good. Schreiner, *Zur Würdigung der Trachinierinnen des Sophokles* (Henzen). Discusses (1) the general idea and the leading rôle, (2) the present constitution of the text. Schubert, *Atlas Antiquus* (Hansen). Useful for general purposes, though not without deficiencies, and on the whole inferior to Kampe. Schiller, *Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Pädagogie* (Curschmann). Warmly recommended.

19. Schneidewin-Nauck, *Sophokles Aias und Philoktetes* (Müller). Pays too little attention to MSS. tradition. Busche, *Observationes criticae in Euripidis Troades* (Mekler). Emphasizes the value of the Palatine MS. and does something for the criticism of a generally neglected play. The readings suggested are discussed. Blaydes, *Aristophanis Acharnenses*. The chief value of the work lies in the collection of the different uses of words. Niese, *Flavii Josephi Opera*, Vols. i. and ii., bks. i.—x. (Hansen). A *κρίσις ἐς ἀεί* based on the collation of a large number of MSS., of which the best are Palatinus and Oxoniensis. Many readings are discussed. Krohn, *Quæstiones de Anthologia Latina* (G. Segebeke). Shews that 74—90 and 120, 121 are Petronian, 91—100 not. Rohrig, *Nigidius Figulus* (Lüdecke). The first chapter discusses the value attached to Nigidius by the authors who used him. The second gives a brief résumé of his various studies. The fragments are not published. Hoffmann, *De mixtis lingue Græcæ dialectis* (Meisterhans). Has positive worth.

20. Merry, *Aristophanes Knights* (Kähler). The commentary is clear and sensible, but contains little that is new. The text is conservative, the attempt to whitewash Cleon is carried too far. Katkoff, *De Codicibus epitomes Harpocrationis* (Sitzler). A careful discussion of the relation of the different MSS. containing the epitome. Wehrich, *Augustini Hipponensis speculum et liber de div. Script.* (††). For both works the text is carefully based on the collation of the best MSS. Heydemann, *Pariser Antiker* (Weizsäcker). A description of many antiquities in the Louvre, the Bibliothèque Nationale and some private collections. Langl, *Griechische götter und Helden-Gestalten* (Neuling). A clear and interesting analysis of the chief works on the subject.

Jahresbericht des philologischen Vereins zu Berlin, June, July, August, September, October, 1888.

(29) Probst, *N. Jahrb. f. Klass. Philol. und Päd* 1886, explains *Od. i. 4, 8* of the lightning which in Italy heralds the approach of spring, and *Mors pulsat* not of knocking at the door, but of passing over the town. (32) W. H. Roscher, *ib.* 1887, on *Od. ii. 13*, 15 ingeniously suggests *pœnas* taking Bosphorum = Bospororum, i.e. the Thracian an Cimmerian. (54) O. Weissenfels, *Horaz. Seine Bedeutung für das Unterrichtsziel des Gymnasiums und die Prinzipien seiner Schülerklärung*: 'seldom is to be found so accurate a knowledge of single points combined with such a comprehensive judgment of the whole.'

On the literature of Lysias, by E. Albrecht. (3) E. J. Shuckburgh, *Lysiae Orationes* xvi. new edition, revised. Shuckburgh has not availed himself of the review of Stutzer (*Phil. Rundsch.* 1883), nor indeed

of what has been done for Lysias since Scheibe's edition in 1855, with the exception to some extent of Blass' *Attischen Beredsamkeit*, of which Shuckburgh's knowledge is superficial. Therefore, in spite of much that is good, the notes and appendices can by no means content us, least of all the text. (6) J. Girard, *Études sur l'éloquence attique*. Although the part about Lysias was written more than thirty years ago, no one can read the book now without pleasure. (8) F. Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit*, 1st part from Gorgias to Lysias, 2nd edition. Blass puts the birth of Lysias B.C. 444, but the objections to the usual date 459 B.C. are not decisive in face of the express testimony of Dionysius that in B.C. 444 he went to Thuri at the age of fifteen. Blass has not altered his opinion on the genuineness of the speeches. As spurious he considers 2, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 20, and as probably spurious 14 and 15. F. J. Snell's edition of *Epitaphios*, Clar. Press, 1887, is also mentioned.

Curtius (1884—1887), by M. C. P. Schmidt.

(6) Meiser, *Beiträge zur Textkritik des Geschichtsschreiber Q. Curtius Rufus*. Curtius wrote A.D. 41. On the morning after the well-known night 'quam paene supremam habuimus' (x. 9, 3) [the night of the murder of Caligula] the consuls gave the watchword *ἀεὺθεπτα* (Joseph Ant. Jud. xix. 2, 3), to which Curtius perhaps alludes in x. 7, 11. The 'ingenious guess' [of Schultess] that *caliganti* (x. 9, 4) is a play on *Caligula* is not probable, as the ancients had a fine ear for the distinction between *cālig-* and *cālig-*. (16) S. Dosson, *Étude sur Quinte Curce, sa vie et son œuvre*. A most complimentary review. With the remark *Quinte Curce ne connaît qu'un critérium, la vraisemblance*, the author 'hits the nail on the head.' Two notes in connexion with Curtius. 1. *The shape of the earth*. Although, like every other cultivated Roman, C. knew that the earth was a globe (a fact known to the Greeks 400 B.C.), he yet allows himself to speak sometimes rhetorically as though it were a mere disc, e.g. ix. 3, 8 *alium orbem*. This is also found in Tac. 2. *Lighting in antiquity*. The passages of C. are referred to by J. M. Miller in two excellent dissertations on this subject, (1) among the Greeks, (2) among the Romans. M. believes that C. x. 5, 24 and 26 refers to the Persian custom of not using lights during a time of mourning. The ancients never saw a light without finding an omen in it.

Cicero's Letters, 1882—1886, by C. Lehmann.

(4) K. F. Süpffe, *M. Tullii Ciceronis epistolae selectae*, 9th edition by E. Boeckel. Rev. ingeniously explains Att. i. 16, 3; i. 17, 11. (6) R. Y. Tyrrell, *The correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero, arranged according with chronological order*, vol. ii. comprises the time from Cicero's return from banishment (Att. iv. 1) to B.C. 52 (from vii. 2). In the introduction Tyrrell treats of the new MSS. to fam. i.—viii. and puts Harl. 2682 in the 13th century. The notes are short and clear, and the text does not challenge contradiction oftener than might be expected in so difficult an enquiry. Among emendations may be noted Att. iv. 13, 1, *ego ut sitis rem ita afuisse*; iv. 16, 15, *ut abste totiens*; iv. 18, 2, *quidem a. d.* (number wanted) *fuisse* for *quidem affuisse*.

(8) Purser, *Hermathena*, 1885, an appendix to Streicher's work on Harl. 2773: ad fam. i. 4, 2, *sceleratissimo tribunorum latrocinio* is approved, cf. Qu. fr. ii. 2, 3. H. has *tiranno*, M. T. omit *tiranno*. M. often has *tiranuuo* for *tribunus*. (13) Purser, *Herm.* 1886, gives readings of a Harl. 2591, not of the same class

as Harl. 2773, at earliest of 14th century. The reviewer deals with the chronology of the last letters, and the genuineness of the Brutus letters. Since P. Meyer's dissertation (1881) against their genuineness, they have been often handled. The reviewer, however, considering the many difficulties of the question, and the fact that those who maintain their genuineness differ among themselves, suspends his judgment. Thus Ruete in his much-commended book, maintains the genuineness of all, even of i. 16 and 17. O. Schmidt and Gurlitt consider these last two as spurious, but while Gurlitt in i. 3, assumes a small, and in i. 15 a lengthy interpolation, Schmidt rejects the notion of interpolation altogether. The question of style is very difficult, as Cicero's style is so various in his letters, but the point must be chiefly decided by the substance. Of miscellaneous contributions to the text or interpretation are mentioned: Maguire (*Herm.* 1881) Qu. fr. ii. 11, 4, *ita sunt multis luminibus ingeni, multae tamen artis*, 'and though the two are not often combined, much skill in composition,' [this is also Munro's 1st interpretation of the text as it stands]; Nettleship's (*Journ. Ph.* 1885), *multae tamen (or etiam) artis ipse dicam, veneris, virum* very far-fetched; Bury (*Herm.* 1885) Att. ix. 18, 3, *equidem ἐξ αὐτοῦ λέγοντας ἴλλαν*.

Herodotus, by H. Kallenberg.

'*Ἡρόδοτος ἱστορίας*, vols. iii. bks. vi. vii., among many improvements are some clever conjectures; vi. 49, *ἐκόντας* for *ἐχόντας* or *ἐπέχ.*: ib. 58, *οὐδ' ἀρχαί* *ᾤδδ' ἔγε* *ρουσίαι* for *οὐδ' ἀρχαίρεσίαι*: 81, *βουλόμενον* *δ' αὐτοῦ* for *μενον -τον*: 137, *τὴν σφί αὐτοῖ* for *τὴν σφίαι αὐτοῖσι*.

(6) E. Ekedahl, *De usu pronominum personalium et reflexivorum Herodoteo*, a very useful statistical treatise. On the difference between *σφι* and *σφίαι* E. remarks that *σφι* is anaphoric, or only slightly reflexive, while *σφίαι* is always fully reflexive. (10) H. Diels, *Herodot und Hecataeus*. (12) Joh. Brüll *Herodots babylonische Nachrichten*, Brüll in a sound dissertation, shows by inscriptions that the Assyrian queen Sammuramit, wife of Ramāu-nirāris III. can in date agree with Hdt's Semiramis, and that Hdt's Nilotris, five generations later, was probably the mother of Nabunit (Hdt's Labyrinth).

Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung ed. E. Kuhn and J. Schmidt. xxix (=NF. parts ix.), 4, 5, and 6.

(1) P. Kretschmer, *Ueber d. dialect d. attischen vaseninschriften*. A long paper attempting to do for Attic vase inscriptions what Meisterhans has done for stone inscriptions. The facts collected deal mostly with sounds; naturally there is little bearing on inflections. The details are too numerous to summarise: the following seem the most interesting points:—the mixed dialect of the 'Chalcidean' vases is due to foreign workmen, not, as Fick thought, to foreign origin (p. 391); argument that 'Ολυττεύς is true Attic for 'Οβυσσεύς (p. 432); exx. of nasal lost before mute (p. 438); evidence for *Κλυταμύστρα* (p. 441); frequent occurrence of *σσ* for the *ττ* which is nearly universal on inscribed stones (p. 449); discussion of *χ φ* (pp. 458–66).—(2) Chr. Bartholomae *D. arische akk. pl. mask. der i, u und r-stämme* (3) the same, *arische flexion der adj. und part. auf -nt-* (4) Indices. F. H.

PROF. K. E. GEORGES.

THE veteran scholar, Prof. K. E. Georges, has sent the following reply to the address of congratulation drawn up by Professors Nettleship and Sonnenschein and signed by a large number of British scholars:

Den Herrn Gelehrten, welche die mir am Tage meiner 60 jährigen Jubiläums als Lexigraph übersendete Adresse gütigst

unterzeichnet haben, sage ich meinen tief gefühlten Dank. Ich bin stolz auf die mir erwiesene Ehre, um so stolzer, als die Theilnahme an meinem Jubiläum in Deutschland fast nur auf den Kreis mir persönlich befreundeter Gelehrten beschränkt hat.

K. E. GEORGES.

Gotha, den 20ten Jan. 1889.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH BOOKS.

- Allen and Greenough's Latin Grammar.* Revised and enlarged by J. B. Greenough, assisted by George L. Kittredge. 12mo. Half morocco. xiii. + 488 pp. Ginn and Co. \$1.32.
- Burt (B. C.)* A Brief History of Greek Philosophy, with a full topical table of contents, a brief bibliography, and numerous foot-notes embracing references to original authorities. 12mo. Cloth. xiv. + 296 pp. \$1.25.
- Cebes' Tablet.* Edited with Introduction, Notes, Vocabulary, and Grammatical Questions by Richard Parsons. 12mo. Cloth. 94 pp. Ginn and Co. 85 cents.
- Cram's Universal Atlas,* Geographical, Astronomical, and Historical. Folio. 375 pp. George F. Cram, New York.
- D'Ooge, (B. L.),* Colloquia Latina, adapted to the Beginners' books of Jones, Leighton, and Collar and Daniell. 12mo. Cloth, 82 pp. D. C. Heath and Co.
- Hale (W. G.)* Aims and Methods in Classical Study. 12mo. Paper. 47 pp. Ginn and Co. 20 cents.
- The Art of Reading Latin: How to Teach it. 12mo. Paper. 74 pp. Ginn and Co. 25 cents.
- Harrington (Karl P.),* Helps to the Intelligent Study of College Preparatory Latin. 12mo. Cloth. 43 pp. Ginn and Co. 30 cents.
- Homer.* Iliad: Books I.—III. Edited on the basis of the Ameis-Hentze edition, by Thomas D. Seymour. Square 8vo. 235 pp. Ginn and Co. (Including Text Edition.) \$1.20 in paper; \$1.50 in cloth.
- The Text alone of the above edition. 66 pp. Paper. Ginn and Co. 25 cents.
- Iliad. Books XIII. to XXIV. for Schools. By D. B. Monro. Small 8vo. Clarendon Press. 6s.
- Iliad. Done into English Verse. By Arthur S. Way. Vol. II. Books XIII.—XXIV. Small 4to. Low. 9s.
- Odyssey. Book X. With Introduction and Notes by G. M. Edwards. 12mo. Cambridge Press. 3s. 6d.
- Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem Townleyana recensuit Ernestus Maass. Vols. V. and VI. 8vo. Clarendon Press. £1 16s.
- Horace.* The Satires and Epistles. Edited by James B. Greenough. 12mo. Cloth. xiv. + 306 pp. Ginn and Co. \$1.35.
- Horace.* The Text alone of the above edition. Paper. Ginn and Co. 25 cents.
- Judson (H. P.)* Caesar's Army. A Study of the Military Art of the Romans in the last days of the Republic. With illustrations and coloured map. 12mo. Cloth. x. + 108 pp. Ginn and Co. \$1.10.
- Lanciani (R.),* Ancient Rome in the light of recent discoveries. With 100 Illustrations. Royal 8vo. 350 pp. Macmillan. 24s.
- Latine Reddenda.* The English-Latin Exercises from Collar and Daniell's *Beginner's Latin Book.* With Glossarium Grammaticum. 12mo. 41 pp. Paper. 20 cents. With Glossarium Grammaticum and English-Latin Vocabulary. 12mo. 58 pp. Ginn and Co. Cloth. 33 cents.
- Lewis (C. T.),* A Latin Dictionary for Schools. Royal 8vo. 1200 pp. Clarendon Press. 18s.
- Lucian,* Selections. Edited, with Notes, by W. R. Inge and H. Macnaughten. 12mo. 250 pp. Rivington. 3s. 6d.
- Lucretius,* De Rerum Natura, liber Quintus. Edited, with Notes, by J. D. Duff. 12mo. 2s.
- Oliver (G. W.),* Typical Sentences; or, Aids to Latin Composition. 8vo. 2s.
- Ovid.* Four Books of the Metamorphoses, Expurgated: with Notes, Illustrations, and a Dictionary, by N. C. Brooks. 3rd revised edition. 12mo. 336 pp. T. W. Hartley and Co., Philadelphia. \$1.75.
- Plinii Caecilii Secundi* Epistulae ad Traianum imperatorem cum eiusdem responsis. Edited, with Notes and introductory Essays, by E. G. Hardy, M.A. 8vo. xii, 251 pp. Macmillan and Co. 10s. 6d.
- Terence,* Andria and Heauton Timorumenos. Edited with an introduction and notes by Andrew F. West. Ph.D. 12mo. Cloth. xl. + 265. Harper and Brothers.
- Thucydides,* Book I. Edited on the basis of Classen's edition, by the late Charles D. Morris, M.A. (Oxon.). Square 8vo. 353 pp. Ginn and Co. (Including Text Edition.) \$1.45 in paper; \$1.75 in cloth.
- The Text alone of the above edition. 91 pp. Paper. Ginn and Co. 25 cents.
- Book V. Edited on the basis of Classen's edition, by Harold North Fowler, Ph.D. Square 8vo. 213 pp. Ginn and Co. (Including Text Edition.) \$1.20 in paper; \$1.50 in cloth.

- Thucydides.* The Text alone of the above edition. 67 pp. Paper. 25 cents.
- Virgil, Aeneid.* Books X., XI. and XII., with English Notes and Arguments. Abridged by Prof. Conington, edited by the late Dr. W. Wagner. 12mo. (Cambridge Texts.) Bell and Sons. 1s. 6d. each.
- Weil (Henri.)* The Order of Words in the Ancient Languages compared with the Modern. Translated from the third French edition, with notes, by Charles W. Super. 8vo. Cloth. 114 pp. Ginn and Co. \$1.25.
- White (John S.)* Entrance Examination Papers. Analysed sets of Examinations presented by Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and Princeton Colleges; together with suggestions regarding preparation for their respective examinations. 12mo. Cloth. iv. + 324 pp. Ginn and Co. \$1.25.
- Xenophon.* Hellenica, Books I.—IV. Edited on the basis of the edition of Büchschütz, by Irving J. Manatt, Ph.D., LL.D. Square 8vo. 300 pp. Ginn and Co. (Including Text Edition.) \$1.45 in paper; \$1.75 in cloth.
- The Text alone of the above edition. 138 pp. Paper. 25 cents.
- ### FOREIGN BOOKS.
- Aeschylus.* Orestie mit erklärenden Anmerkungen v. N. Wecklein. 8vo. iv, 334 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 6 Mk. Separately 3 parts à 2 Mk.
- Amarci, Sexti, Galli Pisistrati,* sermonum libri IV. E codice Dresdensi A. 167a nunc primum ed. Max Manitius. 12mo. xviii, 106 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 2 Mk. 25.
- Andocides orationes,* ed. J. H. Lipsius. Ed. ster. (Schul.-Ausg.) 8vo. xxxii, 67 pp. Leipzig. B. Tauchnitz. 1 Mk. 20.
- Aristophanis comoediae.* Annotatione critica, commentario exegetico, et scholiis graecis instruxit Fréd. H. M. Blaydes. Pars VIII. Ranae. 8vo. xxvi, 551 pp. Halle. Waisenhaus. 10 Mk.
- Baumack (I.) und (T.),* Studien auf dem Gebiete d. Griechischen und der Arischen Sprachen. Vol. I. part II. 8vo. Leipzig. Hirzel. 7 Mk. (Bd. I. ept. 13 Mk.)
- Beyle (Fr.)* Quaestiones Apuleianae. Dissertatio inauguralis. 8vo. 67 pp. Lipsiae. (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht). 1 Mk. 50.
- Brugmann (K.)* Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. Vol. II. part I. Wortbildungslehre [Stammbildungs- u. Flexionslehre]. 8vo. xiv, 462 pp. Strassburg. Trübner. 12 Mk.
- Buechner (W.)* De Neocoria. 8vo. viii, 132 pp. Giessen. Ricker. 3 Mk. 60.
- Burekas (V.)* De Tib. Claudii Donati in Aeneida commentario. 8vo. Jena. 1 Mk. 60.
- Caesar, belli civilis libri III.* In usum scholarum iterum recognovit Bern. Dinter. 12mo. vi, 207 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. Mk. —60
- commentarii de bello gallico. Zum Schulgebrauch mit Anmerkgn. hrsg. von Prof. Herm. Rheinhard. Mit e. geograph., suchl. und Personen Register, 1 Karte v. Gallien. 12 Taf. Illustr. und 15 Schlachtenplänen. 6. verm. und verb. Aufl. 8vo. vii, 255 pp. Stuttgart. Neff. 2 Mk. 70.
- Cicero, Rede gegen C. Verres.* Buch V. de suppliciis. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von Dr. K. Hachtmann. Kommentar unterm Text. 8vo. viii, 125 pp. Gotha. 1 Mk. 20.
- Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca,* edita consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae. Vol. IV. pars 2. 8vo. Berlin. G. Reimer. 4 Mk. 80.
- Corpus inscriptionum atticarum consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae editum.* Vol. II. pars 3. Fol. Berlin. G. Reimer. 40 Mk.
- Crochet (L. C.)* La Toilette chez les Romains au temps des empereurs. (Etude des principaux objets de Toilette en os trouvés dans les fouilles de la Néropole de Trion et du coteau de Fourvière.) Small 4to. 71 pp. 12 full page plates. Lyon, Sézanne Frères. 8 fcs.
- Cuno (J. G.)* Vorgeschichte Roms. Teil 2. Die Etrusker und ihre Spuren im Volk und im Staate der Römer. 8vo. xvi, 899 pp. Graudenz. 25 Mk. (Teil I. II. 43 Mk.)
- Curtius (E.)* griechische Geschichte. Bd. III. Bis zum Ende der Selbständigkeit Griechenlands, nebst Register und Zeittafel. 6. verb. Aufl. Mit 1. Uebersichtskarte v. Nordgriechenland v. J. A. Kaupert. 8vo. iv, 922 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 12 Mk.
- Dieterich (A.)* Papyrus magica musei Lugdunensis Batavi, quam C. Leemans edidit in Papyrorum graecarum tomo II. [V.] Denuo edidit commentario critico instruxit, prolegomena scripsit. [Extr. Jahrb. f. class. Philol. Suppl. Bd. 16.] 8vo. 81 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 2 Mk.
- Dionysi Halicarnassensis antiquitatum romanarum* quae supersunt ed. Carolus Jacoby. Vol. II. 12mo. iv, 408 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 3 Mk. (I. and II. 6.60.)
- Duncker (M.)* Griechische Geschichte bis zum Tode d. Perikles Lfg. XVII. (last). 8vo. (Bd. V. pp. 353—325). Leipzig. Duncker and Humblot. 2 Mk. (Complete, 5 vols. £1 14s.)
- Feichtinger (E.)* kurzgefasste griechische Formenlehre [des attischen Dialectes], leichtfasslich dargestellt. 2te gänzlich umgearb. Aufl. 8vo. iv, 72 pp. Wien. Holder. 1 Mk.
- Friedlaender (F.)* Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms in der Zeit von August bis zum Ausgang der Antonine. 6. neu bearb. und verm. Aufl. Thl. I. 8vo. xxxii, 586 pp. Leipzig. Hirzel. 12 Mk.
- Fritzsche (H.)* Untersuchung über die Bedeutung v. Consensus und Consentire in den Digesten. 8vo. 102 pp. Berlin. Muller. 2 Mk.
- Fügener (F.)* Livius XXI.—XXIII. mit Verweisungen auf Cäsars bellum Gallicum für die Bedürfnisse der Schule grammatische untersucht. 8vo. x, 160 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 3 Mk. 50.
- Georges (K. E.)* Lexikon der lateinischen Wortformen. Lieferung 1. 8vo. iii, 160 cols. Leipzig. Hahn's Verlag. 2 Mk.
- Gessner (A.)* Servius und Pseudo-Asconius. Inaugural-Dissertation. 8vo. 64 pp. Zürich (Leipzig. Fock.) 1 Mk. 50.
- Grasberger (L.)* Studien zu den griechischen Ortsnamen. Mit einem Nachtrag zu den griechischen Stichnamen. 8vo. ix, 391 pp. Würzburg. Stahel. 8 Mk.
- Graul (R.)* die antiken Porträtmalereien aus den Grabstätten d. Faijumm. Verbesserter Abdr. aus der Zeitschr. f. bild. Kunst. mit. e. Anhg v. Donner v. Richter. Mit 2 Heliograv. und 7 Text illustr. 4to. vi, 28 pp. Leipzig. Seeman. Bound. 4 Mk.
- Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft in

- systematischer Darstellung mit besond. Rücksicht auf Geschichte und Methodik der einzelnen Disziplinen. In Verbindg. mit Dr. Autenrieth, D.D. Blass, Bauer etc. hrsg. v. Prof. Dr. Iwan Müller. Halbbd. X. XII. XIII. 8vo. (Bd. III. xi, pp. 689-923, Band VII. 663 pp. each 5 Mk. 50. Nördlingen. Beck.
- Harnack (A.)** Die Akten des Karpus, des Papyrus und der Agathouke, eine Urkunde aus der Zeit Marc Aurels. pp. 433-466. (Gebhardt und Harnack, Texte. Band 3. Heft 3 and 4.) 16 Mk.
- Hausbold (P.)** De rebus Illensium. Dissertatio inauguralis. 8vo. 68 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 20.
- Haury (J.)** Quibus fontibus Aelius Aristides usus sit in componenda declamatione, quae inscribitur *Παρασκευασμός*. 8vo. 34 pp. Augsburg. Leipzig. Fock. Mk. —70.
- Henry (V.)** Précis de grammaire comparée du grec et du latin. Deuxième édition revue et corrigée. 8vo. xx, 356 pp. Paris. Hachette. f. 750.
- Herrmann (P.)** das Gräberfeld v. Marion auf Cypern. 48. Berliner Winckelmann-Programm mit 3 Taf. 4to. 64 pp. mit. eingedr. Illustr. Berlin. G. Reimer. 4 Mk.
- Hermann (K. F.)** Lehrbuch der griechischen Antiquitäten. Unter Mitwirkg. von Droysen, A. Müller, Thalheim und Thumser neu herausg. v. Prof. Blümer und Dittenberger. Bd. I. Abthg I. 8vo. Freiburg. Mohr. 6 Mk. Contents: Lehrbuch der griechischen Staatsalterthümer 9te verm. u. verb. Aufl. umgearb. and hrsg. v. Prof. Dr. V. Thumser. Abtg. I. xviii, 272 pp.
- Herzog (A.)** Studien zur Geschichte der griechischen Kunst. Mit 6 Taf. in Lichtdr. 4to. iii, 64 pp. Leipzig. Engelmann. 7 Mk.
- Hiller (Ed.)** Beiträge zur Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker. 8vo. 132 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 3 Mk. 20.
- Holm (Ad.)** Griechische Geschichte von ihrem Ursprunge bis zum Untergange der Selbständigkeit des griechischen Volkes. Bd. II. 5. Jahrg. v. Chr. Lfg. 1-4. 12mo. pp. 1-384. Berlin. Calvary. Subscr. Pr. each 1 Mk. 50.
- Hölzer (V.)** Beiträge zu einer Theorie der lateinischen Semasiologie. vii, 194 pp. 8vo. Berlin. Calvary and Co. (Berliner Studien f. class. Philologie.) 6 Mk. 50.
- Huemer (C.)** die Genesis des Entschlusses in den Tragödien d. Euripides u. Sophokles oder üb. den objektiven Charakter der griechischen Tragödie. Eine ästhet. Studie. 8vo. 76 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 20.
- Joannides (E.)** Sprechen Sie attisch? Moderne Conversation in altgriechischer Umgangssprache nach den besten attischen Autoren. 8vo. viii, 68 pp. Leipzig. Koch. 1 Mk. 20.
- Josephi opera omnia.** Post J. Bekkerum recognovit S. A. Naber. Vol. I. 12mo. xxv, 334 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 3 Mk.
- Kauffmann (G.)** De Hygini memoria scholii in Ciceronis aratum Harleianis servata. 8vo. 91, 83 pp. Koebner, Breslau. Mk. 3.60 (Breslauer philolog. Abhandlungen.)
- Kiepert.** Wall map of ancient Gaul and Germany. in 9 sheets. 1: 1,000,000. Berlin. D. Reimer. 12 Mk.
- Knoke (Fr.)** Die Kriegszüge des Germanicus in Deutschland. Nachtrag. 8vo. Berlin. Gaertner. 5 Mk. (Hauptwerk mit Nachtrag, 20 Mk.)
- Koch (E.)** Übungsbuch zur griechischen Formenlehre. Heft 2. 8vo. 71 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. Each 1 Mk.
- Köhler (E.)** der Sprachgebrauch d. Cornelius Nepos in der Kasussyntax. 8vo. vi, 46 pp. Gotha. F. A. Perthes. Mk.—80.
- Kühnert (F.)** Über das pactum de non praestanda evictione. Inaugural-Dissertation. 8vo. 54 pp. Lüneberg. (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.) 1 Mk. 40.
- Lackner (W.)** de incursionibus a Gallis in Italiam factis quaestio historica. Pars II. 4to. 15 pp. Gumbinnen. (Koch, Königsberg). Each 1 Mk.
- Lattmann (I.)** über den in Quinta zu beginnenden lateinischen Unterricht, nebst einem entsprechenden Lehrbuche. 8vo. 41, 168 pp. 2 maps. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht. 2 Mk. 50.
- Lebas (Ph.)** Voyage archéologique en Grèce et en Asie Mineure (1842-44). Planches de topographie, de sculpture et d'architecture gravées d'après les dessins de E. Landron, publiées et commentées par S. Reinach. 4to. xxiv, 162 pp. Plats: Itinéraire 72; Monuments figurés 151; Architecture, 89. Paris. Didot. 30 fres.
- Liebenow (W.)** Forschungen zur Verwaltungsgeschichte d. römischen Kaiserreichs. Bd. I. Die Legaten in den Röm. Provinzen v. Augustus bis Diocletian. 8vo. v, 482 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 12 Mk.
- Lockroy (E.)** über die Zukunft d. classischen Unterrichts in Frankreich, aus dem Franz. übers. von I. Singer. 8vo. 16 pp. Wien. Koenig. Mk.—50.
- Meyer (W.)** Epistulae imperatorum romanorum ex collectione canonum Avellana a W. Meyer editae. 4to. 41 pp. Göttingen. Dieterich. Mk.—80.
- Müller (H. D.)** und I. Lattmann, Griechische Grammatik für Gymnasien. Auf Grundlage der vergleichenden Sprachforschung bearbeitet. Teil 2. Ausg. B. Syntax der attischen Prosa, von H. D. Müller. 8vo. viii, 116 pp. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht. 1 Mk. 40.
- Neue (D. F.)** Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache. Band II. Adjectiva, Numeralia, Pronomina, Adverbia, Präpositionen, Conjunctionen, Interjectionen. 3te gänzlich neu bearbeitete Auflage von C. Wagener. Lieferung 2-4. 8vo. pp. 65-256. Berlin. Calvary and Co. Subscription price, each 1 Mk. 50.
- Noni Marcelli compendiosa doctrina.** Emendavit et adnotavit Luc. Müller. Pars II. 8vo. 428 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 12 Mk. (cpl. 32 Mk.)
- Pernice (A.)** formelle Gesetze im römischen Rechte [Extr. from Festgabe für Rud. v. Gneist.] 8vo. 35 pp. Berlin. Springer. 1 Mk. 20.
- Petersen (J.)** In Galeni de placitis Hippocratis et Platonis libros quaestiones criticae. 8vo. 64 pp. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht. 1 Mk. 40.
- Pfersche (E.)** die Interdite d. römischen Civilprocesses. Eine rechtsgeschichtl. Untersuchg. 8vo. vi, 159 pp. Graz. Leuschner and Lubensky. 3 Mk. 50.
- Πινδάρου τὰ σωζόμενα μετὰ μεταφράσεων σημειώσεων καὶ πινάκος τῶν λήξεων εἰς τόμους ε' ὑπὸ Κ. Κλεάνθους.** 8vo. xxxi, 456; ix 517; viii, 371; vii 317 and 340 pp. Triest, 1886 and 1887 (Schimpff). 20 Mk.
- Pullig (H.)** Ennio quid debuerit Lucretius. Particula I. Dissertatio inauguralis philologica. 8vo. 44 pp. Halle. (Leipzig, Fock.) 1 Mk.
- Raveack (P.)** De Platonis Timaeo quaestiones criticae. 8vo. 81 pp. Berlin. Mayer and Müller. 2 Mk.
- Reisig (K.)** Vorlesungen üb. lateinische Sprachwissenschaft. mit den Anmerkgn. von Prof. F. Haase. 2 Tl. neu bearb. v. Prof. F. Heerdegen. 1 Lfg. pp. 1-96. 1 Mk.
- Ruge (W.)** Quaestiones Strabonianae. Diss. inaug. 8vo. 107 pp. Leipzig. (Jena, Pohle). 2 Mk.
- Schiess (Tr.)** Die römischen collegia funeraticia nach

- den Inschriften. 8vo. vii, 141 pp. München. Th. Ackermann. 3 Mk.
- Schmidt* (A.) Abhandlungen zur alten Geschichte. Gesammelt und hrsg. von Prof. Fr. Rühl. 8vo. vi, 568 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 12 Mk.
- Schneider* (J.) Die alten Heer- und Handelswege der Germanen. Römer und Franken im deutschen Reiche. Nach örtl. Untersuchungen dargestellt. Heft. 6. 8vo. 31pp. Düsseldorf. F. Bagel. 1 Mk. (1—6, 10 Mk.)
- Schultz* (O.) Die Ortsgottheiten in der griechischen und römischen Kunst. 84 pp. 8vo. Berlin. Calvary and Co. Mk. 3. (Berliner Studien f. class. Philologie.)
- Soltan* (W.) Die römischen Amtsjahre, auf ihren natürlichen Zeitwerth reducirt. 8vo. vi, 64 pp. Freiburg. Herder. Mk. 2.
- Sonne* (E.) de arbitris externis, quos Graeci adhibuerunt ad lites et intestinas et peregrinas componendas quaestiones epigraphicae. 8vo. 126 pp. Gottingae. (Leipzig, Fock). 2 Mk.
- Sophocles*. Antigone. In scholarum usum ed. J. Holub. 8vo. xii, 47 pp. Wien. Konegen. Mk.—56.
- Stock* (M.) De Vitruvii sermone. De formis enuntiationum temporalium. Dissertatio inauguralis philologica. 8vo. 40 pp. Berlin. R. Heinrich. 1 Mk. 20.
- Sturmhoefel* (A.) Scene der Alten und Bühne der Neuzeit. Ein Beitrag zur Lösung der Volkstheaterfrage, zugleich ein Versuch zur Raumgestaltung grosser Zuschauerräume; aus den bisher üblichen Theaterformen entwickelt. 8vo. 114 pp., with 15 illustrations. Berlin. Ernst and Korn. 8 Mk.
- Tacitus*. Ab excessu divi Augusti libri qui supersunt. Scholarum in usum ed. Ign. Prammer. Pars. II. Libri XI.—XVI. 8vo. xxvi, 295 pp. Wien. Gerold's Sohn. 1 M. 70 (cpl. 3 Mk. 50).
- Thraemer* (E.) Pergamos, Untersuchungen üb. die Frühgeschichte Kleinasiens und Griechenlands. 8vo. Map. x, 421 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 10 Mk.
- Thumb* (A.) Untersuchungen üb. den Spiritus asper im Griechischen. 8vo. viii, 103 pp. Strassburg. Trübner. 2 Mk. 50.
- Valeri* (Julii) Alexandri polemi, res gestae Alexandri Macedonis translatae ex Aesopo Graeco. Accedunt collatio Alexandri cum Dindimo, rege Bragmanorum, per litteras facta, et epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem, magistrum suum, de itinere suo et de situ Indiae, recensuit B. Kuebler. 12mo. xxxii, 261 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 2 Mk. 70.
- Valerii Mazini* factorum et dictorum memorabilia libri IX. Cum Julii Paridis et Januarii Nepotiani epitomis iterum recensuit C. Kempf. 12mo. xxxiv, 672 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 4 Mk. 50.
- Wagner* (E. A.) Die Erdbeschreibung d. Timosthenes von Rhodus. 8vo. 73 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 80.
- Wendorff* (F.) Erklärung aller mythologie aus der Annahme der Erringung der Sprechvermögens [mit vorzüglicher Berücksichtigung des griechischen und sanskritischen Idioms]. 8vo. v, 199 pp. Berlin. G. Nauck. 12 Mk.
- Werner* (Rud.) De L. Annaei Senecae Hercule, Troadibus, Phoenissis quaestiones. 8vo. 54 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk.
- Winkler* (A.) Die Darstellungen der Unterwelt auf unteritalischen Vasen. 98 pp. with 1 plate. 2 Mk.
- Wirth* (Albr.) quaestiones Severianae. Diss. historica. 8vo. 61 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 80 Mk.
- Wirtzfeld* (A.) De consecutione temporum Plautina et Terentiana. Commentatio grammatica. 8vo. 51 pp. Siegburg. Dietzgen. 1 Mk.
- Xenophon*. Agesilaos, für den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. Otto Güthling. 8vo. v, 68 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 50.
- Zedicks* (Γ. Δ.) Λέξικον πάντων τῶν σημάτων τῆς ἀττικής περὶ γραφικῆς διαλέκτου. 8vo. 56. 704 pp. Athens. 10 drachmas.
- Zacker* (K.) die Handschriften und Classen den Aristophanesscholien. Mitteilungen and Untersuchgn. [Extr. Jahrb. f. klass. Phil., 16 Suppl.-Bd.] 8vo. 246 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 6 Mk.
- Zeller* (Ed.) Die Philosophie der Griechen, in ihrer geschichtl. Entwickl. dargestellt. Vol. II. part I. Sokrates und die Sokratiker. Plato und die alte Akademie. 4te Aufl. 8vo. x, 1050 pp. Leipzig. Fues. 20 Mk.